

6234

THE
Fathers Vindicated:

OR,

ANIMADVERSIONS

On a late Socinian Book

EntitPd,

The Judgment of the Fathers
Touching the TRINITY, against
D^r Ho. Boscawen's Defence of the Ni-
cene Faith.

BY

A Presbyter of the Church of
ENGLAND.

by J. Deacon. (Nanjum)

LONDON:

Printed for H. Gillman, at the Rose and
Crown in St. Pauls Church-Yard, MDCXCVII.

THE
Fathers Vindicated:

OR,

A NIMADVERSIONS

On a late Socinian Book

Intitl'd

The Judgment of the Fathers
Touching the TRINITY, against
Doctor Bolingbroke's Defence of the
same Faith.

BY

A Presbyter of the Church of
ENGLAND.

By J. Pearson.

LONDON.

Printed for H. Smith, at the Key and
Crown in St. Pauls Church-Yard, 1704.

THE
Fathers Vindicated,

Touching the

TRINITY.

THE
Fathers Vindicated,



TRINITY

The Contents.

CHAP. III.

A Review of the Writings which
M. N. has in general for the
Options of the Christians before
the Council of Nice.

CONTENTS.

CHAP. IV.

That matter is the Apo-
stles Creed, not Clements Ro-

A Chapter of M. N. and of
the Scheme that he has
form'd of the Newness of the O-
pinions of the Trinity, and of
the Divinity of Jesus Christ.

Page 1.

CHAP. II.

A General Enquiry in M. N's Sy-

stem

p. 8.

CHAP.

The Contents.

CHAP. III.

A Review of the Witnesses which
M. N. brings in general for the
Opinions of the Unitarians before
the first Council of Nice. p. 22.

CONTENTS

CHAP. IV.

That neither the Authors of the Apo-
stles Creed, nor Clemens Ro-
to Immaculis, were of the Opinions of the
Unitarians. p. 41.

CHAP. V.

That the Nazarens, the Ebionites,
the Minzeans, and the Alogians,
were justly looked upon as Here-
ticks. p. 58.

CHAP. VI.

CHAP. VII.

The Contents.

CHAP. VI.

*That neither Hegesippus, nor the
Fifteen first Bishops of Jerusalem,
were of the Opinion of the Cerin-
thians, or the Ebionites: And
that the Alogi were Hereticks as
well as the Cerinthians.* P. 77.

CHAP. VII.

*That Justin Martyr was no Imo-
vator.* P. 93.

CHAP. VIII.

*That the Notion of the Alogi did
not come from the Platonicks,
but was the antient Notion of
the Synagogue, and of the Apostles
of our Saviour.* P. 110.

THE

The Contents.

CHAP. III.

*A Review of the Witnesses which
M. N. brings in general for the
Opinions of the Unitarians before
the first Council of Nice.* p. 22.

CONTENTS

CHAP. IV.

*That neither the Authors of the Apo-
stles Creed, nor Clemens Ro-
to Imaculis, nor of the Opinions of the
Unitarians.* p. 41.

CHAP. V.

*That the Nazarens, the Ebionites,
the Minzeans, and the Alogians,
were justly looked upon as Here-
ticks.* p. 64.

CHAP. VI.

CHAP. VII.

The Contents.

CHAP. VI.

*That neither Hegesippus, nor the
Fifteen first Bishops of Jerusalem,
were of the Opinion of the Cerin-
thians, or the Ebionites: And
that the Alogi were Hereticks as
well as the Cerinthians.* P. 77.

CHAP. VII.

*That Justin Martyr was no Imo-
vator.* P. 93.

CHAP. VIII.

*That the Notion of the $\Delta\lambda\gamma\omicron$ did
not come from the Platonicks,
but was the antient Notion of
the Synagogue, and of the Apostles
of our Saviour.* P. 110.

THE

CHAP. VI.

That neither Hegesippus, nor the
 Fifteen first Bishops of Jerusalem,
 were of the Opinion of the Genu-
 lines, or the Ebionites: And
 that the Alogi were Heretics as
 well as the Ebionites. p. 110.

PAGE 11. Line 24. For *the* *Christians*
 P. 24. L. 15. L. *Thomson*
 P. 41. L. 10. A. *Hermetus* *Papstus*
 P. 42. L. 18. L. *Conary*
 P. 43. L. 19. L. *Conary*
 P. 44. L. 17. L. *Conary*
 P. 45. L. 18. L. *Conary*
 P. 46. L. 16. L. *Conary*
 P. 107. L. 12. L. *and*

CHAP. VII.

That the Nation of the Alogi
 not come from the Ebionites,
 but was the ancient Nation of
 the Samaritans; and of the
 of our Nation. p. 110.

THE
FATHERS

VINDICATED

Touching the TRINITY, &c.

CHARLES HERICK, *Author*
A Character of M. N. and of the Scheme

that be bath form'd of the Necessity of
the Opinions of the Trinity, and of
the Divinity of Jesus Christ.

SIR,
THO' I have a great regard to
the Commands that you lay
upon me, yet it is not without
some Unwillingness that I have
undertaken to examine the Book entituled,
The Judgment of the Fathers concern-
ing

ing the Trinity, against Dr. Bull: For the Reverend and Learned Dr. Bull is best able to do this himself, and can do it with very great ease: and his Adversary being a Man who seems to have in him a great confidence of Temper, joyn'd to as great a Detestation of Novelty; I have little Inclination to be concern'd with him. However, I have learn'd to obey; especially where my Obedience may be thought to do service to Truth.

Tom II.
Sec. p. 710.
& 711.

M. D. is of the Opinion of *Isaacus David*, who deny'd the Lawfulness of invoking *JESUS CHRIST*, and was for that reason detested by *Socinus*, as a Heretick, that renounced the Principles of Christianity, and had a design to bring in among Christians the Jewish Ideas about the Person of the *Messiah*.

De Autho-
rit. Scr.
C. 1. §. 3.

Socinus was a zealous Assertor of the Authority of the Holy Scriptures, and proved it with such Arguments, as cannot be answer'd: Especially for the Books of the *New Testament*; he hath shew'd with great Judgment that they can't be suspected of having been corrupted by any Party or Set among Christians. And where any Text makes evidently against his opinion, yet nothing could provoke him to question the Authority of

of it. Whosoever is conversant in his Writings, can't but see what infinite pains he hath taken to evade the force of divers of those Texts which prove the Godhead of our Saviour. But *M. N.* little considering the pains that *Socinus* hath taken, and without giving himself any trouble to confute *Socinus's* Arguments, to prove the Purity of the Books of the *New Testament*; boldly asserts, that the Gospels and Epistles have been falsified by those whom he calls *Trinitarians*; who, as he tells us, have added to them what they pleas'd. This Accusation he often repeats with a groundless assurance.

So that now, the state of the Dispute, is wholly changed from what it was with *Socinus*, and the Learned Writers of his Sect. It seems we must no longer contend for the Divinity of our Saviour, or the Doctrine of the Trinity. But our Controversy now with *M. N.* and his Collegues, is principally about the Purity of the Holy Scripture, just the same that we have with some of the *Mahometans*, who accuse the Christians of having corrupted the Gospels. And though at this distance from *Turky*, God be thanked, we are in no danger of that

p. 30, 31.
& p. 63. col. 1.

The Fathers vindicated

4

Tom. I. p.
227. Tom.
II. p. 173.
L. 1.

Sect, yet we are not so secure against the *Deists* and *Atheists*, who are chiefly concern'd in this Controversie, as being the profest Enemies of the Christian Religion. The *Socinians* do profess themselves *Christians*; but yet one can hardly think them in earnest that write at this rate. They are either downright *Deists*, or they are certainly in a great forwardness towards it; of which they were warn'd long since by *Socinus* himself. He warn'd those of his Sect that deny'd the Worship of *Christ*, as our *M. N.* expressly doth; that if they went on, they would become *Deists* and *Epicureans*.

However, you desire me to let you know my Thoughts of this Book of *M. N.* and to examine the *Plan* which he hath form'd of the Belief of the most Primitive Antiquity, concerning the Trinity, and the Divinity of our Saviour; which at your desire I will endeavour to do.

If we may believe *M. N.* he brings us up to the very beginning of the change; and doth all he can to perswade the World, that he sets forth the Manner of it; so that for the future there will be nothing more easie than to judge of the Truth and Apostolical Antiquity of

touching the Trinity

of the Doctrine of the Unitarians.

But see in a few words what M. N. teacheth us of the Antient Faith: He telleth us the Holy Scripture saith nothing, either of the Trinity, or of the Godhead of our Saviour. So that according to the Scripture, there is but one Person, as well as one Nature in God: and, That *Jesus Christ* is but a meer Man, miraculously born of the Virgin by the virtue of the Holy Ghost; indued with a power of doing Miracles, and at last taken up into Glory to govern the Church, and the World, at least, as far as the Church is concern'd in it.

He tells us the Apostles writ that Creed which is commonly called by their name; and that they deliver'd no more than that Creed in the confession of Faith which they prescribed to all Christians.

He would have us believe that the first Bishops of *Jerusalem*, and the first Bishops of the greatest Cities in the World, who were Successors to the Apostles, adher'd to this belief without any alteration, till the slaughter and dispersion of the Jews under *Hadrian*, that is till about the year of our Lord 135.

The *Jews* that were converted by the Apostles and their successors, and the *Heathens* that were converted by the Apostles, and by Apostolical Men out of *Palestine*, continued till then, as he tells us, in the opinion of the present *Unitarian*.

P. 15. B.

About that time, or at least about the year 130, when all the Protestants, as Mr. M. tells us, agree that the Doctrine of the Church began to be corrupted, *Justin Martyr* thought fit to set up the Doctrine of the Trinity. He avers that *Jesus Christ* was the Eternal Word. He proved it against *Trispho* the Jew, by the Apparitions of God that are related in the Old Testament.

He tells us that as soon as *Justin Martyr* had published his Conference with *Trispho*, a great number of Christians quitted the simple Notions that they had of the Deity, to perplex themselves with those new Ideas of the Trinity. That they then took up the Doctrine of the Godhead of *Jesus Christ*, which was an Opinion never before heard of. This Belief spread abroad, and took so generally, from *Justin Martyr*'s time to the Council of *Nice*, that although the Antient Christians, whom he calls the *Naturalists*,

NATURALISTS,

the *Arians*, the *Minians*, the *Ebionites*, the *Cerinthians*, and the *Manichaeans*, defended the ancient Doctrine concerning the Unity of God, and rejected the Belief of the Trinity, and of the Godhead of the Saviour, properly so call'd; yet the multitude of those that believ'd the Trinity, and the eternal Godhead of Jesus Christ, prevail'd in the first Council of *Nice*, and made this Heresie pass into an Article of Faith.

This, Sir, is the System of *M. N.* which he establishes by divers considerations out of Antiquity, and which he makes as probable as he can, by answering *Dr. Bull's* Arguments, with all the dexterity and confidence that he is Master of.

I desire you would not expect that I should dispute with *M. N.* about all that he alledges, and particularly about that which he saith against *Dr. Bull*. The Doctor, who will probably write for all the Three parts of *M. N's* Book, of which he hath yet publish'd, but the first, will be very well able, to do right both to himself and his cause.

Nor will I take notice of all that he saith, without authority, and yet with as much confidence as if he had all authority

thority in himself. It is enough to let the *Unitarians* see how rash their Champion is in his Assertions, to abate something of the Veneration which they have for an Author of so little Judgment or Modesty.

To do this with the more clearness and usefulness; I think it the best way.

First, *To examine his System in General.*

Secondly, *To inquire into the Authorities, that he brings to justify it.*

And Thirdly, *To make it appear, that he hath no ground to accuse Justin Martyr, as he doth, of Innovation.*

I think I may under these three Heads take in all that is worth considering in his Judgment of the Fathers.

CHAP. II.

A General Enquiry into M. N's System.

WE shall first give a general Account of his Opinion, concerning the Doctrine of the Trinity, and the Godhead of our Saviour.

I. He saith, That the writings of the Old Testament have nothing in them to ground the Belief of a Trinity, and of the Godhead of the *Messiah*. He saith

faith *Justin Martyr* is the first that hath gathered both the one and the other out of the Writings of the Old Testament. Herein *M. N.* agreeth with the present *Jews*.

But to say nothing of what *Jesus Christ* and his Apostles have taught of this Matter, about which he makes a great stir to little purpose; It's plain, that the first *Christians* are against him in the Disputes that they had with the *Jews* before *Justin Martyr* had written. And this it will be no hard Matter to prove.

1. It is scarce to be conceiv'd; that *Justin Martyr*, having a *Jew* to dispute with, should go about to convert him with a new Notion of which himself was the first Author; and not only so, but that he should have the confidence to publish in the face of the World a private Dispute, which he had with a *Jew* upon that subject.

We may well imagine, that a *Soci-nian*, who rejects the Trinity and the Godhead of our Saviour, would easily agree with a *Jew* about these Opinions, and leave them out of the dispute, to make the *Christian Religion* more easie and agreeable to a *Jew*. But supposing that

that before *Justin Martyr* these Doctrines had never been heard of, and that *Justin* thought he had discover'd them in the Writings of the Old Testament, is it probable, that he would have made them such principal Points of the Controversie in disputing with a Jew, And that he would have pretended to ground them upon Authorities out of the Old Testament?

2. We need but consider the manner how *Justin* disputes with the Jew to be satisfi'd, That he did not advance any new Doctrine.

He proposeth two Questions. The First, Whether *Jesus* is the promised *Messias*? Which he saith he can maintain against *Tyrpho*, though he should not acknowledge *Jesus* to be any more than moer Man. The Second, Whether *Jesus Christ* had a Being before his Incarnation? Whether he was God? Whether he was born of a Virgin? Which he affirms to have been the Doctrine of the Prophets, and of *Jesus Christ* himself. *Justin* advanceth these Propositions, as being such as were generally receiv'd among the *Christians*. He quotes his Authorities out of the Books of the Old Testament; and carefully confutes the different

different Solutions which the Rabbins used to evade these Arguments: Which sheweth, that his Proofs were drawn out of Scripture, and were not new to the Jews; but that the Dispute having continu'd ever since the Apostles times, the Jews had been diligent in finding Answers to these Objections; and that, as it often happens among them that plead for a bad Cause, they were already divided among themselves; such an Answer as hit the Fancy of one Rabbi, being not satisfactory to another. It will be sufficient to bring one Example of it, out of many that I could produce.

Philo the Jew, long before the Year of our Lord 40, in explaining these Words of God, *Let us make Man in our own Image*, makes this Reflection, *That this implyeth the taking in of others as fellow Workmen.* And elsewhere he maintains, that Man was made in the Image or Likeness of the Word. The Christians having, afterward alledged that Passage for the Proof of the Trinity, the Jews were obliged to say, some of them that God spake to the Angels, others that he spake in the Plural because

De epis.
Mundi
p. 16. c.
De confus.
ling. p. 395,
& 396. De
profug. p.
460, & 461.
Et de no-
min. mu-
tat. p. 1048,
& 1049.
De epis.
Mundi p. 32.
Et de
plant. Noe
p. 217.

of

P. 285. B.
C. D.

of his Majesty, and others that he spake to the Elements, out of which the Body of Man was to be compos'd. These Answers, being invented before *Justin's* time, he mentions, and rejects them with Scorn. It appears then, That the *Christians* before *Justin's* time did believe the Trinity, because the *Jews* in his time were so divided among themselves as I have shewn, and made such different Answers to the Objection which was made to them by the *Christians*. But I shall shew, that the *Jews* before *Justin's* time accus'd the *Christians* of acknowledging the *Messias* to be true God, as well as Man. This will plainly appear by what followeth.

We need but consider in what manner *Justin* speaks of those among the *Christians*, that rejected the Divinity of *Jesus Christ*, and believ'd him to be a Man born of *Joseph* and *Mary*, for that is what he expresseth in these Terms, ἀνθρώπου ἐκ ἀνθρώπων γάρβουρου. A Man born of human Parents, which he opposeth to ἀνθρώπου διὰ τῆς παρθένου. A man born of a Virgin. See how he expresseth himself, ὁ γὰρ αἰὶν τῆς ἀντρὸς καὶ τῆς παρθένου γὰρ ἐμφορῆται αὐτῷ Χριστῷ ἀπαι, ἀνθρώπου δὲ ἐκ ἀνθρώπων γάρβουρου ἀνπαρθένου.

P. 267.

οὐκ ἔστιν οὐκ ἔστιν, ὡς αὐτοὶ πλεονεκτήματα
 δοξαζομένης, αἰσίου, ἐκείνου ἐκ ἀνθρώπων δι-
 δαγμασι κατελευόμενα ὅτι αὐτὸ τὸ Χριστὸν
 ταῦτα, ἀλλὰ τοῖς τῶν μακαρίων προφ-
 ητῶν κηρύγμασι καὶ αὐτὸ διδάσκον. For
 there are some among us who confess that
 that he is CHRIST, but affirm him to be
 Man born of humane Parents; with whom
 I do not agree; nor would it be said by
 most of them that we of my Opinion; for
 we have been commanded by CHRIST
 himself, not to believe the Doctrines of
 Men, but to believe those things, which
 were publish'd by the Holy Prophets, and
 taught by CHRIST himself. The
 word πλεονεκτήματα, as it is here oppos'd to the
 word τινες, hath a great extent in the
 Greek; it signifies the far greater num-
 ber, and the τινες, that here Justin Mar-
 tyr speaks of, he consider'd as such a
 sort of Christians as those whom Tiberi-
 us would have made, if the Senate
 would have consented to it, by procu-
 ring the Apotheosis of Jesus Christ because
 of his great Miracles, without examining
 whether he were born of a Virgin, or of
 Joseph and the Virgin. But withal it
 appears, that Justin Martyr, together
 with the πλεονεκτήματα, that is the Body of
 the Christians, were of the Opinion

Tertul. 4.
 p. 102 c. 9.

which he defends against Trypho's Objections; and that they defended it, as grounded upon the Authorities of the Apostles, and of Jesus Christ himself.

Certainly if we give our selves the trouble to examine the Pains that Rabbi Jochanan takes to instruct the Babylonian Jews, of whom he was the Chief, how to answer the Christians who proved the plurality of Persons in the Godhead, out of the Books of the Old Testament, we shall see that it was not a Doctrine brought up by Justin Martyr after Hadrian's time. This Rabbi particularly answers the Arguments which the Christians drew from those words, Gen. I. 26. *Let us make Man in our own Image*, together with the like words, Gen. XI. 7. *Come, let us go down and confound their Language*, and likewise from Deut. IV. 7. from 2 Sam. VII. 23. from Dan. VII. 9. And he reports a more antient Objection drawn from that which we read of the Angel, that conducted the Children of Israel in the Wilderness. Exod. XXIII. 21. Can any one that hath not lost his Reason, imagine that Rabbi Jochanan, who liv'd amongst the Jews a little after the Year of our Lord 170, and in a Countrey that

Gemara in
esp. 4. lib.
Sanhedrin
fol. 38. col. 2.

that was almost always at War with the *Roman Empire*, should go about to confute the Notions of *Julian Martyr*, whose name it is not likely he had ever heard of, if these Notions had not been common to all Christians? At least if he had seen that these Notions generally gain'd ground in the Belief of the People, would he not have spared his pains in answering those Arguments, and taken a shorter way to confute this Doctrine, by shewing that it was a new thing which he had seen the very beginning of, and that it was not yet so much as the common Opinion of those that were separated from the Synagogue?

M. N. saith that those Doctrines of the Divinity of *Jesus Christ*, and of the Trinity, were not deliver'd in any of the Books of the *New Testament*; but that they have been invented since the writing of those Books. And yet the Jews reject these Books on this very account, because they contain these Doctrines; which, say they, are contrary to what hath been deliver'd in the *Old Testament*. It might seem a very strange thing that the Jews should find these Doctrines in the Gospels, and the other Books of the *New Testament*; and that the *Unitarians*, who

who call themselves Christians, and therefore ought to be much better acquainted with these Books, should not be able to discover any such thing in them. Or if it be shewn them that these Doctrines are there, in those very places which the Jews object against, that the *Unitarians* should dispute against the natural Sense of the words, and endeavour to elude it with forced and far fetch'd Interpretations. But the Strangeness goes off, when we see that these Gentlemen do not believe themselves. We cannot but judg so of this Writer, who, though he disputes and denies as confidently as the rest, yet confesses at last that these Doctrines are in the *New Testament*; for he says they were foisted in there by the *Trinitarians*. And for this, if you will not take his word, you have *Mahomet's* that said it before him.

But that the first Disciples of the Apostles did not receive from them the Doctrines either of the Trinity, or of the Godhead of our Saviour; of this he is certain, because they were not known before *Justin Martyr's* time. If so, what could *Pliny the Younger* mean? Who, after he had informed himself of the Worship of the Christians, about the year

*Plin. lib. X.
Epist. 97.*

year of our Lord 106, gave this account of it to *Trypho*. That the Christians worshipped *Christ* as a God; for it was in their publick Worship that he saith they did *carere Christo quasi Deo dicere, say a Hymn to Christ as God.* What could the Author of the *Philopatri*, that goes under the name of *Lucian*, mean by teaching that the Trinity is the God of the Christians? This Author was contemporary with *Justin Martyr*, and very well knew the Christian Religion, and attributes this Doctrine to *St. Paul* the Apostle. What could be the meaning of *Trypho*, who was *Justin's* Adversary, in objecting it so often to the Christians that they worshipped *Jesus Christ* as a God? What could be the meaning of the Philosopher *Celsus*, that flourished under *M. Aurelius*, when he reproach'd the Christians with believing the Divinity of our Saviour, as a Doctrine that was generally condemned both by the *Jews*, and by the *Gentiles*?

Though *M. A.* knoweth but little of the Writings of those times, and therefore may be excused for thinking others to be as ignorant as himself in these matters; yet he ought not to take all the

C

World

Lucian Philopatri

V. Bulli def. Fid. Nic. p. 124, 125.

Justin. N. adv. Tryphonem.

Origen contra Cels. p. 512. c. 1. 162.

World to be such Fools, that he may pass upon them what he will by his bare Affirmation. But it is plain that he doth so in these following Instances, which have no other bottom but his vain Imaginations. *Justin Martyr* publish'd his Dialogue about the year of our Lord 140. It is a Dispute with the *Jews* in defence of the Christian Faith. Well, what then? He tells us that *Justin* advanceth a Doctrine before wholly unheard of, concerning the Person of *Jesus Christ*, and the Nature of God; namely, that *Jesus Christ* is God, and that he ought to be worshipp'd; that he was begotten of the Father before all Creatures; that there are in the Godhead Three that are different *numero*, though not *essentia*. He tells us farther, that as soon as *Justin* had publish'd this Work, which was in Greek, and which was unknown to the greatest part of the Christians, all the World forsook the Ideas which they had before of the Deity, and of the Person of our Saviour; and that they began every where to worship him, whereas they before look'd upon him as a meer Creature. He tells us that hereby they gave a new and just

just Scandal to the Jews, and made the convert Gentiles return to the Idolatry which they had forsaken. He saith, the *Nazarens* and the *Ebionites* opposed themselves to this Innovation; but all in vain; for all the World was so incanted with this Novelty, that they run into it blindfold. It was follow'd and embraced both by Clergy and People throughout all Nations.

Surely *M. N.* must believe that *Justin M.* had Apostles whom he sent to all parts, and bestow'd on them the gift of Tongues, and of working Miracles; otherwise how could he be able in thirty years to overthrow that Gospel which *Jesus Christ*, and his Apostles, and their Successors, had been now near an hundred years in establishing? For not long after this, about the year 170, *Irenæus* declares that the common Faith of the Churches all over the World was that of the Trinity, and of the Godhead of our Saviour. The Apostles also of *Justin Martyr* must necessarily have been more powerful than our Saviour's Apostles. For according to *Trypho* the Jew, and according to *M. N.* the Gospel would have been much more probable,

L. I. c. 2, 3,
G L. III.
C. 4.

if it had not been perplex'd with the Doctrines of the Trinity, and of the Godhead of the *Messias*.

What is singular in this System of *M. N.* is, that according to him the Jews were not sensible of this change, nor did they ever reproach the Christians with it; that the Pagans and their Philosophers did not take notice of it, nor ever objected it against the Christians; that all the Christians throughout the whole Roman Empire receiv'd the change without the least dispute; that those without the bounds of the Roman Empire receiv'd it without any the least repugnance; in a word, that these Christians, that were so ready to run to Martyrdom for the defence of their Religion, which in the esteem of *M. N.* had been so very reasonable in case there had been nothing in it of the Trinity, and of the Godhead of *Jesus Christ*; were still more ready to throw away their Lives in defence of a Doctrine that was new, and that *M. N.* thinks more extravagant and absurd than any that was ever before heard of in the World. *M. N.* or any body else

could not have been more than he was

We learn from an *Anonymous* Author, that writ in the beginning of the Third Century, that *Artemon* boldly affirmed that which *M. N.* maintains at this time, viz. that the first Disciples of the Apostles knew nothing of the Trinity, nor of the Incarnation of the Word; and that the Doctrine which affirms that *Jesus Christ* was a mere Man, was the Doctrine of the Christian Church, till the time of *Victor* Bishop of Rome, and of *Zephyrin*, that is till about the year of our Lord 190, or 200. *M. N.*'s Assertion is a little more within compass. He contents himself with saying that the Doctrine of the Unitarians was the common opinion of the Christian Church till the time of *Justin Martyr*. So that he allows the Doctrine of the Trinity, and of the Godhead of our Saviour, to be fifty years older than *Artemon* did. Another Unitarian Writer, that may be a little modester than *M. N.* may afterwards happen to reform his account, and so carry up the Original of the Faith that we defend as high as the time of *Jesus Christ*, or the Apostles; and yet he may oppose it at last as *M. N.* doth, by questioning the

Euseb. Hist.
Ecc. V. 28.

the Authority or the Purity of the Scriptures.

But after this General Reflection upon *M. N.*'s System, which may be sufficient to overthrow the whole design of his Treatise against *Dr. Bull*, we shall enter into a more particular Consideration of what he sets forth, to give some sort of account of the Chymical System which he hath framed.

CHAP. III.

A Review of the Witnesses which M. N. brings in general for the Opinions of the Unitarians before the first Council of Nice.

M. N. makes no scruple of charging *Dr. Bull* with unfair dealing, for bringing the Authority of but twenty Doctors, whom he calls Approved Men, to prove the consent of the whole Church to the Doctrine of our Saviour's Divinity before the Council of *Nice*, when he can produce two hundred that held the Unitarians Doctrine upon this point; and there-

thereupon he triumphs over the Doctor for having impos'd upon his Reader, by the liberty which he hath taken to pick out what Authorities he pleas'd, and to reject such as condemned his opinion.

But *M. N.* is grossly mistaken; for Dr. *Bull* hath followed the Method of *Vincentius Lirinensis*, which is approved by all Christians, and by *M. N.* himself: It is this, that a Doctrine is to be accounted Catholick, when it hath the approbation of all, every where, and at all times. That the belief of the Divinity of our Saviour had this Character the Doctor hath proved by above twenty Witnesses, which he hath brought out of several places of them that lived in several Ages, before the first *Nicene* Council, which Witnesses were look'd upon always as Orthodox in those times. Twenty Authors of this Character are sufficient to establish this truth.

If Dr. *Bull* hath qualified these twenty Witnesses as approved Fathers, he might very well call them so, both because these Authors have been always look'd upon as true Disciples of the Apostles, and also because the Doctor hath quoted

only such Books as the Church hath
always reputed authentick or worthy
of these Illustrious Authors.

M. N's two hundred pretended Wit-
nesses, whose works are perished by
reason of their Errors, are a Dream of
his own; and consequently are of no
authority in the least to be thus oppo-
sed in a heap to the Fathers that are
proposed by Dr. BAIL.

But who after all are these Witnesses
that in those Apostolical times maintained
the Doctrine of the Unitarians? M. N.
reckons among his Witnesses: *Theodotus*,
Symmachus Paulus, *Samosatenus*, *Theodo-
rus of Byzantium*, *Apollonides*, *Heliophi-
lus*, *Lucianus*, the Authors of the Apo-
stolical *Recognitions and Constitutions*:
Melito Bishop of Sardis, the *Nazarens*,
the *Ebionites*, whom he supposeth to
have had great Churches in *Palestine*, in
Syria, and in *Arabia*, and the *Mineans*
that were spread all over *Asia*; moreover
all the Fifteen first Bishops of *Jerusalem*.

All this is but a Chimera of M. N's,
who fancies what he pleaseth, and after-
wards Disputes for it, as if he writ for
none but ignorant People.

1st. We

14. We have Reason to wonder, how *M. Arminius* came to forget *Arrianus*, who is mention'd by the Fathers of the Second Council of *Constantinople*, as the first Author that held the Opinions of *Pseudo-Symeon*, which they condemned about the Year 450; so obscure and unknown were the Names of the rest of them at that time.

25. Why doth he not take Care to oppose to Dr. *Baile* *Wines*, some Authors that were Successors to the Apostles, and that lived in the Ages near their Times? For he doth not quote any Writer, but such as lived after *Justin Martyr's* time; and *Wines* the most ancient of his pretended Witnesses presented his Apology to *M. Aurelius*, about the Year of our Lord 160, or perhaps some years later.

37. How unreasonably doth he couple the *Unitarians*, that thought Jesus Christ to be mere Man, or begotten of *Joseph* and *Mary*, or of *Mary* by the operation of the Holy Ghost, to such as *Dionysius* Presbyter of *Antioch*, and the Authors of the *Recognitions* and *Constitutions*, who own'd the Divinity of Jesus Christ and his Pre-existence, tho' their Conceptions

tions of the Divinity were very imperfect, and not very agreeable to the Scriptures and good Sense? The *Arians* as *M. N.* tells us, and particularly *Eusebius* of *Cæsarea* were the greatest Enemies of the *Unitarians*: Nevertheless he doth them the Favour to reckon them among the *Unitarians*, to oppose them to the Witnesses that are brought by *Dr. Bull*. It is plain that he doth this to abuse ignorant People, who do not examine so closely into Matters. The *Arians* did own the Pre-existence of the Word, and proved it from Texts of both Old and New Testament; and the *Unitarians* and *Socinians* reject it as a Doctrine that hath no ground in Sacred Books. But for all that *M. N.* takes in those that maintain'd the opinion, which was afterwards defended by *Arius*, among the Disciples of *Artemon* and *Paulus Samosatenus*, as some kind of Officers take in any that come in their way to make a false Muster, not regarding how fit they are for service, for they intend them only for a present shew.

Let us look a little more particularly into the Characters of *M. N.*'s Witnesses. The most ancient of them is *Melito* Bishop

Thop of *Sardis*, whom one would not have expected in his Roll, for this *Melito* writ a Treatise with this Title, *Περὶ τοῦ ἐνανθρωπήσαντος Θεοῦ* which is as much as to say, *about the Incarnation*. And yet *M. N.* list's him for an *Unitarian* because he writ another piece Intituled, *Περὶ Χριστοῦ*. *M. N.* infers from this Title, that *Melito* held that *Jesus Christ* was a Creature; but thereby he only betrays his Ignorance. For it appears by the Title of the Book that *Melito* was so far from designing to prove that *Jesus Christ* was but a Creature, as *M. N.* fallsly imagines, that he writ it to shew that *Jesus Christ* was not a Creature, but the only Son of God by Generation properly so called. His scope being to solve an Objection which was made against the Filiation of the Son, out of that Greek Translation of the VIII. of *Proverbs* in which the Divine Wisdom saith *Θεὸς ὁ πρῶτος Θεὸς ἐκ τίνος ὁ Θεὸς ἐποίησέν με* in the beginning of his way; which Passage *Iustin M.* hath consider'd in his Dialogue with *Trypho*, and the other Fathers have explain'd it against the Objections of the *Arians*. That this is no ill grounded conjecture, will appear by the Testimony

Euseb. L.
IV. c. 26.

P. 284.

Euseb. L. V.
c. 28.

Testimony of an Author, that writ in the beginning of the Third Century against the Heresie of *Artemon*, who reckons *Melito* among the defenders of our Saviours Divinity. *Nam Irenæi quidem, & Melitonis, & reliquorum scripta, quæ est qui ignorat, in quibus Christum Deum simul & hominem prædicaverunt?* For who 'is there that doth not know the works 'of *Irenæus*, and *Melito*, and others, in 'which they have set forth Christ both 'as God and Man?

The Second Witness that *M. N.* reckons upon, is *Theodotion*, who was by some People, as *Jerom* tells us, affirmed to be an *Ebionite*. *Epiphanius* saith, that he was a Pagan by Birth, and turn'd Christian. But what sort of Christian? He profess'd the Opinions of *Tatian*, of *Marcion*, and of *Ebion*. After this he turn'd Jew, renouncing Christianity and receiving Circumcision. He learn'd Hebrew, and translated the Old Testament in the time of the Emperor *Severus*. This is *M. N.*'s mighty Critick, and his Witness of the highest Authority. I must Confess, that some of the Greek Churches had so good an Opinion of *Theodotion's* Translation of *Daniel*, that they pre-
ferred

fer'd it before the Septuagint Version. But how doth this prove that *Theodotion*, if he was sometimes an *Ebionite*, was therefore lookt upon as an orthodox Christian, or one to whose Judgment they ought to pay any great deference? Besides, who doth not know that the *Syrian* and *Latin* Churches, who had the Septuagint translated into *Syriack* and *Latin*, did constantly follow the Septuagint in the Book of *Daniel*?

Symmachus is another of *M. N.*'s Witnesses, but he is just such another as *Theodotion*, that is, only such a one, as a Writer, that regarded his Credit, would be ashamed to reckon of his side. *Symmachus* was by Religion a *Samaritan*; he left the *Samaritans* because they had not a sufficient value for his Merits, and embraced the Jewish Religion; he was disgusted at the Jews because they also did not prefer him as he thought he deserv'd; and therefore he turn'd Christian; afterwards he went over to the *Ebionites*, and undertook to write for their Opinions. This he did in a Commentary upon *S. Matthew's Gospel*, not that which we have, but the *Nazarene Gospel*, which all Christians since have lookt upon as an Apocryphal

phal piece, and a meer Forgery. Hath not M. N. great reason to triumph in the Merits of such an Author?

Now for another of his Witnesses, no less remarkable than the former. He brings in *Theodorus* a Currier, who was born at *Byzantium*, and came afterwards to live at *Rome*. There he was Excommunicated by Pope *Victor*, for being the first Teacher of this Heresie in that City. He was the more remarkable, because *Artemon*, or some of his Disciples afterwards, had the impudence to say, that *Victor* himself was a maintainer of this Heresie, and that before *Victors* being Bishop of *Rome*, the Doctrine that asserted Jesus Christ to be meer Man was receiv'd by the Church without any Contradiction. These are the words of that Writer.

Euseb. V.
c. 28.

Quomodo eos non pudet hujusmodi calumniam adversus Victorem concinnare, cum certo sciant Theodorum coriarium, qui defectionis illius Deum abnegantis parens & author fuit, primusque Christum nudum hominem esse asseruit, per Victorem à communione ecclesie ejectum fuisse. Nam si, ut aiunt, Victor eadem sentiebat qua illorum docet impietas, cum Theodorum opinionis illius autorem ab ecclesia

clesia removit? How are they not ashamed, saith he, to throw this calumny upon *Victor*, when they very well know that *Theodotus* the Currier, who was the Father and Author of that Apostacy of denying God, and who was the first that asserted Jesus Christ to be meer Man, was cast out of the Communion of the Church by *Victor*? For if, as they say, *Victor* was of the opinion which they impiously hold, why did he excommunicate *Theodotus*, who was the Author of that Opinion?

As for *Apollonides* and *Hermophilus*, who are produced by *M. N.* with such high Characters, he must either be wholly void of shame, or he hath never read that part of *Eusebius* which I have now quoted. For see the Character which this Anonymous Author in *Eusebius* gives of them. After having set forth that they despised the simplicity of the Scriptures, and studied only human Learning and Sciences, making them a rule by which to judge of matters of Faith, He accuseth them of having corrupted the Sacred Books under pretence of Correcting them; he offers

offers to convict them of having falsified the Scriptures by comparing the Copies that were in their hands, and by shewing the diversity of Readings that was to be found in their own Copies. This Corruption he chargeth particularly on the Copies that were revised by Theodotus, and those that were revised by Asclepiodorus. He sheweth that Hermophilus had also made several Corruptions in the Text, and that Apollonides had done the like in a first and second review. And then he makes this reflection upon the bold Impiety of these Men; *Quam parvo auditu sit ejusmodi facinus, ne ipsas quidem ignorare credibile est. Idem enim sacras scripturas à Sancto Spiritu dictas esse non credunt, ne proinde infideles sunt: aut semetipsos Spiritu Sancto sapientiores esse existimant, ac proinde quia aliud sunt quam Dæmoniaci. Neque enim negare possunt hoc factum à se admissum esse, cum ipsorum manu descripta sint exemplaria, neque ab illis à quibus in Christiana fide instructi sunt ejusmodi codices deciperent, Nec offendere possunt exemplaria, ea quibus sua illa descriperunt.* And for such a Crime as this, it is scarce to be believ'd

'bellow'd, that they could be ignorant
 'how horrible a thing it is. For they
 'must either believe that the Holy
 'Scriptures were not dictated by the
 'Holy Ghost, and then they were Infir-
 'dels, or they must think that they
 'are wiser than the Holy Ghost, and if
 'so, what are they but *Demonacks*?
 'Nor can they deny that they are guilty
 'of this Crime, for the Copies are of their
 'own hand writing, and they neither
 'receiv'd such Books from those who in-
 'structed them in the Christian Faith,
 'nor can they produce the Originals out
 'of which they transcribed them.

Paulus Somasatenus Bishop of *Antioch*
 was a true *Sotiniack*, for he acknow-
 ledg'd nothing more than human, to
 be in our Lord Jesus Christ. He suc-
 ceeded *Demetrius* in that See, but soon
 after his coming in, he was discover'd
 to be an Impostor, that conceal'd He-
 retical Notions. Whereupon they as-
 sembled a Council against him at *Antioch*.
 There at first he avoided Con-
 demnation by making before the
 Council, and all the people there as-
 sembled, a satisfactory Profession of the
 Catholick Faith, after he had us'd

many vain endeavours to disguise his Opinions. Afterwards he relapsed into his Heresie which himself had condemned, and he was so well discover'd and convicted of it, that he could not escape being condemned in a very numerous Council, that was assembled upon his account out of several Provinces of the Roman Empire. And in a *Synodical Epistle* yet extant, they acquainted the world what kind of Man he was. Particularly they shew'd how he made the Episcopal Dignity a means to heap up excessive riches; they shew'd his Ambition, in having joyn'd to his Episcopal Office, the temporal Dignity of being *Ducenarius*, which render'd him formidable to all the people of *Antioch*; his Vanity, in seeking applause in the Church as if he were on a Theatre; and his Licentiousness, in keeping young Wenches in his house, and suffering his Clergy to do the like, and so indulging them in their Lewdness, that he might be himself supported in his. This is the brave Man whom the *Unitarians* so highly exalt;

Domnus being set up in *Paul's* room, could not get Possession of the Bishop's house in *Antioch*; that City being then in Possession of *Zenobia* Queen of *Palmyra*, who was half a Jew, and therefore could not but favour *Paul*, being so near her in Religion. But soon after, the Emperor *Aurelian* having got Possession of the City, and there conquer'd *Zenobia*, receiv'd Complaints from the Church of *Antioch* against *Paul*, who, notwithstanding his deprivation, kept possession of the Bishop's house, and also from *Paul* who complain'd of the Injustice of those that condemn'd him. *Aurelian* being willing to gratifie them that were most capable to do him Service, and not willing to concern himself otherwise in their Affairs, referr'd the consideration of these complaints to the Bishops of the Diocesses of *Rome* and *Milan*. They condemn'd *Paul* as a Heretick, whereupon he was driven out of the Bishop's house by command of the Emperor *Aurelian*. After which we hear no more of him, but that his Sect was continued by one *Lucian* Priest of that City, who was therefore

Euseb. L.
VII. c. 27.
& seq.

excommunicated by three Bishops of *Antioch* successively.

This *Lucian* our Author will have to be the same with the famous *Lucian* Priest of *Antioch*, who was Martyr'd about forty years after the ouping of *Paulus Samosatenus*. We cannot blame our *Socinians* that they are willing to adorn their Sect with his Name, for did so the *Arrians* before them, being taught so to do by their Master *Arrius*, who pretended to be this *Lucian's* Disciple, as appears by his Letter to *Eusebius* of *Nicomedia*, whom he calls *Collucianist*, because they both held the Opinions of *Lucian*. But as it is certain that no Man can be both *Arrian* and *Samosatenian*, for the *Arrians* Anathematize the *Samosatenians* as damnable Hereticks, so that *Lucian* the Martyr was of neither of those Sects, it appears by the Creed which is yet extant, and by other Testimonies which the learned Dr. Bull hath brought together in the Book that *M. N.* pretends to answer.

Epiphan.
Hæret. 69.
p. 732.

For the *Apostolical Recognitions and Constitutions*; these Books do not at all make for *M. N.'s* Opinion, because they
are

are full of *Arrian* Doctrines, which are not consistent with those of our *Unitarians*. But *M. N.* hath a mind to shew that he is not too scrupulous in his choice of Witnesses. Though he condemns these very Writers of extravagancy, for believing that they saw sufficient Proofs of the Pre-existence of Jesus Christ as to his Divinity in the Books of the Old and New Testament, but nothing comes amiss to him, he knows how to make use of any thing that comes in his way, whether it makes for him or against him. Which Licentiousness of his in a matter of so great importance as this is, will not recommend him to the good esteem of any judicious Reader.

But hitherto he hath brought his Authorities single, now he comes with whole Armies of them together. He tells us of whole Churches of the *Mineans*, or otherwise of the *Nazarens*, that were in the time of *S. Jerom* spread all over the *East*. This, saith *M. N.* is what *S. Jerom* shews in his 89th. Epistle, which was to *St. Austin*.

One that understands the *Notitia* of those times, can scarce tell where to

find these pretended Churches which *M. N.* proposeth as Authorities for the Unitarian Doctrine: And indeed it is in vain to look for them; for in a word, they were no other than Jews, such as were in the Body of the Synagogue, who were by the Pharisees accounted *Nazarens*, and so condemned as Hereticks, because tho' they profest Judaism, they notwithstanding acknowledged Jesus Christ to be the *Messias* whom God had promised to their Nation. See the words of *S. Jerom.* *Usque hodie per totas Orientis Synagogas inter Judeos heresis est, qua dicitur Mineorum, & à Phariseis nunc usque damnatur: quos vulgò Nazareos nuncupant, qui credunt in Christum filium Dei natum de Virgine Maria, & eum dicunt esse qui sub Pontio Pilato passus est & resurrexit: in quem & nos credimus: sed damus volunt & Judæi esse & Christiani, nec Judæi sunt, nec Christiani.* There are at this time in all the Synagogues amongst the Jews of the East some Hereticks that go by the name of *Minxi*, who to this very day are condemned by the Pharisees and called *Nazarens*; they believe in Jesus Christ the Son of God born of the Virgin

Virgin Mary, and they say it was he who suffered under Pontius Pilate, and rose again the Third day from the Dead. This could be no other than the same Jesus in whom we believe. But while they would be both Jews and Christians, they become neither Jews nor Christians.

Must he not have lost all sense of Shame that goes to impose thus upon his Reader? It is true, that S. Jerom tells us, That the Jews curs'd the Christians in their Synagogues by the Name of *Nazarens*, and still to this day they give that Name to all that acknowledge Jesus Christ to be the *Messias*; thinking thereby to perswade us, that because Jesus Christ lived at *Nazareth*, which was in the Tribe of *Zabulon*, therefore by consequence he could not be the promised *Messias*. But doth it follow from thence that the *Nazarens* or the *Minaans*, of whom S. Jerom speaks before, were not Members of the Synagogue? And being so they were properly Jews and not Christian *Unitarians*.

I have but one thing more to say in this place, of the Witnesses which *M. N.* brings against Dr. Bull, being

Upon Euseb.
L. V. c. 11.

afterwards to speak of the *Cerinthians*, of the *Ebionites*, and of the fifteen first Bishops of *Jerusalem*. But here I cannot but take notice how he endeavours to impose upon his Reader, when he quotes *Valesius*, and makes him say; that the Errors that were in the Books of some of the antient Writers, soon made their Works to be neglected, and at length to be totally lost. *M. N.* being now to hunt about for Witnesses, catcheth up these among the rest, imagining that all those whose works are perisht were *Unitarians*, and among the rest he reckons *Papias*, *Hegesippus* and *Clemens Alexandrinus*.

L. V. c. 18.

But he wrests the words of *Valesius*; for he speaks of Errors in general, and not particularly of those of the *Unitarians*. Tis a plain Mark that the thing was so; because its certain, that *Clemens Alexandrinus* was reckon'd among the Defenders of the Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, by the Author that refuted *Artemon* in the beginning of the Third Century, of whom there is a Fragment in *Eusebius*. I shall make the same appear of *Hegesippus* in what followeth, and it will be easie

to

to judge by Parity of reason that the like holds true of *Papists*; and

~~that the few pieces which they expect to find in the same manner~~

~~But for the~~ **CHAP. IV.**

That, neither the Authors of the Apostles Creed, nor Clements Romanus were of the opinions of the Unitarians.

SINCE my principal Design is only to shew the vanity of *M. N.*'s System, I shall not stay to examine what *M. N.* objects against *Dr. Bull*'s Authorities. The Doctor, as he saith, brings his Authorities from forged pieces, which he makes use of as if they were Apostolical writings, such as, the Epistle of *Barnabas*, *Hermas*, *Pastor*, and the Epistles of *St. Ignatius*, upon all which *M. N.* Criticizes to make a shew of his Learning in Antiquity.

It would be ridiculous to enter the Lists with *M. N.* in a dispute concerning the Antiquity, or the Authority of those pieces that are quoted by *Dr. Bull*, these Subjects having been sufficiently handled

handled by learned Men of the first Rank; and it is in vain for *M. N.* to expect, that his few petty Objections will carry the Point against their Arguments and Decisions.

But for *Dr. Bull*, it is enough to have proved that these pieces were written before the first Council of *Nice*, which the *Socinians* accuse of having innovated, and that they plainly teach the Doctrine which the Council of *Nice* have defined. This is what *M. N.* hath not ventured to deny.

But let us suppose, if he pleases, and if he thinks it will do him any service, that these pieces were forged in the beginning, or even in the middle of the second Century, as *M. N.* pretends, doth it follow, that the Testimony of these Authors is of no value, or consideration to prove that the Divinity of our Saviour was the current Doctrine of those times in which these pieces were written? *M. N.* hath very little Judgment or Consideration if he thinks so.

These, saith he, were forged pieces; but he cannot deny, First, But that they did hold a considerable Rank among the Ecclesiastical Books, in the times

times before the first *Nicene* Council, and that many Churches read some of them publickly with great veneration. Secondly, If they were forged he cannot deny but that it was for some other end, than to make this Doctrine of Jesus Christ's Divinity to be received in the Church, one needs but read them to make him agree to all this.

As for *Ignatius's* Epistles, *M. N.* supposeth that they were invented to confirm the Authority of Ecclesiastical Orders, and from hence he takes occasion to shew his Talent in railing against the Clergy. But then that these pieces might pass for genuine, the Forgers of them must have spoke of the person of Jesus Christ, as he was generally spoken of in those times in which they lived. So that *M. N.* gets nothing by all this, unless he can pretend that *Iustin Martyr*, or some of his first Disciples that made these counterfeit pieces, conform'd them to his own Principles and Opinions.

But how wisely doth *M. N.* suppose, that *Clemens Alexandrinus* might take that piece which goes under *Barnabas's* Name to have been written by *Barnabas* the

the Apostle, notwithstanding that the Writer of it plainly taught and maintain'd that Doctrine of the Divinity of Christ; and yet *M. N.* in the Chapter next before, had affirm'd that *Clement's Hypotyposes* were slighted and lost for this reason, because they so much abound with the Seed of *Arianism* and *Unitarianism*? After this we have no great reason to rely upon *M. N.*'s Judgment.

I shall not take notice of his insipid railleries upon *Pierius's* Revelation about *St. Ignatius's* Epistles. There are none but weak People that look upon it as truth. But one must make himself very ridiculous to take occasion from thence to doubt of *Polyarp's* Martyrdom, which was asserted by the Church of *Smyrna*, whereof he was Bishop, in their Epistle that is extant in *Eusebius*. Those that shew their Wit in taking advantages against Truths of History, from the Fables that were invented in obscure times, shew they have very little strength either of Wit or Judgment. A Judicious Man will always take care not to confound Truth with Fable, nor will he go to disprove

a Matter of Fact, or a certain Truth by a Fable that was tackt to it in after ages. For while he affects to make the ignorant laugh at the ridiculousness of the Fable, he will only stir up the indignation of the Lovers of Truth, who cannot endure to see it treated in that manner.

I shall now consider the Witnesses that *M. N.* brings against us as of uncontestable Authority, and which he saith, prove the Doctrine of the *Unitarians* to have been universally received by the Church in the time of the Apostles and of their Successors, until *Justin Martyr's* time, whom he is pleased to brand with the Infamy of being an Innovator in the Christian Faith. To this end he musters up the Apostles as Authors of the Creed, *St. Clemens Romanus* a Disciple of *St. Paul*, and the Primitive Churches that were planted by the Apostles, under the names of *Nazarens*, *Mineans*, or *Alogians*, and the Author of the *Recognitions*, who, if we may believe him, were all *Unitarians*.

If we ask him, why he reckons the Authors of the Creed among the *Unitarians*,

tarians, he tells us, that they have made no mention either of the *Trinity*, or of the Divinity of Jesus Christ; but that they have described our Lord Jesus Christ as a Man, though not as a common one because of his miraculous Conception. If we ask him, why he affirms that the Apostles were Authors of that Creed, he tells us, that *Vossius* and *Dupin* deny'd it was theirs, only because this Creed passeth over in silence the Mysteries which the Papists and Protestants look upon as the foundation of their Religion, and thereupon he takes a great deal of pains to confute *Vossius* and *Dupin*.

It is indeed a Question of no very great importance, whether or no the *Apostles* were Authors of this Creed. But setting aside that matter for the present, here are Matters of Fact to be considered.

1st. Though it is certain that the Apostles did teach their *Catechumens*, whether Jews or Pagans, an Abridgement of the Christian Doctrine; yet no one hath spoke of it before *Irenaeus*, who giveth us a form of Christian Doctrine much

much differing from that which hath been in the Roman Church.

2^{dly}. We do not read that this form was in use among any of the Hereticks that were known in the first or second Century.

3^{dly}. Most part of the Articles of the Creed were framed in opposition to the Heresies which arose in those Antient times. For example, the Article which saith that the Father of Jesus Christ was the *Maker of Heaven and Earth*, was oppos'd to the Heresie of *Marcion*. The Article that *Jesus Christ is the only begotten Son of God*, was oppos'd to the Heresie of *Cerinthus*, who held that Jesus was a meer Man, and that the Christ descended upon him in the shape of a Dove, and left him again when he was ready to die.

Those that upon a critical Examination of the Antiquity of the *Creed*, have deny'd that it was compos'd by the Apostles, had not the least thought of the design which *M. N.* layeth upon *Vossius* and *Dupin*. Nor could *M. N.* suspect them of such a design, unless he imagines, as there is reason to believe

lieve he does; that all the *Trinitarians*, and also the *Arians*, have for above 1500 years repeated this Confession of Faith, without being sensible how inconsistent it was with their Belief, and that *Vossius* and *Dupin* were the only Men that did perceive it, yet did not dare to shew that they did; but left it to *M. N.* to discover what they thought, and he hath been so kind as to do it for them.

Whatever we judge in this matter, if *M. N.* had thought of what he writes. He would have made the same reflection in this place, that he did in condemning *Barnabas's* Epistle. There he proved that the *Antients* could not really believe it to be *Barnabas's*; for if they had, they would have reckon'd it among the Canonical Books. This reasoning is just and solid, but it destroys all that *M. N.* hath writ, to prove that this Creed was composed by the Apostles, and that they dictated it in so many words; for where is that *Hebraistical Writer* that ever reckon'd this Creed which we call the Apostles among the Canonical Writings of the New Testament? And doth *M. N.* who is so witty

witty upon the Revelation of *Pionius* about *St. Polycarp's* Martyrdom, take that for genuine, which we read in a Sermon that goes under the name of *St. Austin*, how every one of the Apostles contributed his Article to make up the number of twelve in the body of this Creed?

2^{dy}. What did *M.N.* think of, when he affirm'd so positively that *Rufinus*, who writ about the year of Christ 400. was the first that explain'd the Apostles Creed? Did not the Church of *Jerusalem* pretend to teach their *Catechumens* the Apostles Creed, upon which their Bishop *St. Cyrill* writ his Exposition? Yet we see their Apostles Creed differs very much from that which we have in *Rufinus*, and *Rufinus* doth not pretend that his Apostles Creed was used any where else but in *Italy*. By what Authority can *M. N.* make it appear, that the Church of *Jerusalem* left off the Creed of the Apostles to be used by them of *Aquileia*, and framed another for themselves that was unknown to the rest of the Christian World?

I believe *M. N.* will never be able to persuade any reasonable Man, that the

E

Church,

Church, if it had receiv'd the Creed from the Apostles, in the same terms in which we have it, would ever have consented to let it be alter'd; nor would the Bishops have dar'd to substitute another, there having been one already at *Jerusalem*; nor would the People, who had learnt it before their admission to Baptism, have ever receiv'd another from them; at least the imposing of it would have caus'd terrible divisions.

It is very well known how *Arianism* prevailed in the East for sixty years, all which time the *Arians* without doubt put another sense on that Article, *And in Jesus Christ his only Son and Lord*. But after all, the People retained the Orthodox Sense of the Article; and the Ears of the People that had been baptiz'd into the belief of the *Trinity*, were more pure than the Lips of their Teachers that endeavour'd to impose upon them.

But is not *M. N.* wholly singular in his Judgment of this matter? He pretends, with his head full of the *Unitarian* Opinions, to give us the sense of the Creed, and would make us believe that the Authors of it were *Unitarians*.

But

But they that first quoted the Creed as an Abridgement of the Doctrine of the Church, were of a far different opinion; namely *Irenaeus*, who was probably as old as *Justin Martyr*, not elder than he, and who wrote within twenty years after him, being Bishop of Lyons at that time; and *Tertullian*, who writ within fifty years of *Justin Martyr*, and was very well read in the Writings of the first Christians. Yet both these were so far of *Justin's* opinion, that they lookt upon those as Hereticks who would not acknowledge the eternal Divinity of Jesus Christ. How came they to strike in so early with *Justin*, and to suffer him so to impose upon them in so great a point of the Christian Faith? Were they so simple as not to discover that he put a quite different sense upon this Article from that which the Apostles designed when they made it, and which continued among all the Apostles Successors till the year of our Lord 150, which *Irenaeus* must needs have known, being then above thirty years of age when *Justin* writ, and *Tertullian*, though he was younger, could not but have read or heard of this Innovation.

But not to rely only on the Authority of *Irenaus* and *Tertullian*, for the sense of that Article about the Person of Jesus Christ; we know the Jews understood very well the meaning of the words, *Jesus Christ his only Son our Lord*; for they knew, as may be seen in several places in *Philo*, that the word *Κεϋς*, *Lord*, was equivalent to that of *Θεος*, or *God*; only that the first expresseth the Empire of God. How much better then was it known to the Christians? who, as *Pliny* saith, in his time, before *Justin Martyr* was born, sang in their Assembly a Hymn to Christ, as God. The title of *only Son* is of the same power with *Κεϋς* among the Jews, as I shall shew from *Philo*, who often calls him the *First-born*; and *St. Paul* represents him under the same Idea, as being *Heir of all things*, and *by whom God made the World*; and therefore justly the Object of Adoration of the Angels.

Ecb. 1.

Since we have not left us any Explanation of the Creed by the *Cerinthians* or the *Ebionites*, which they could pretend to have received from the Apostles, *M. N.* must pardon us if we stick to the Notions

Notions, which the Fathers declared that they did receive from the Apostles, I say such Fathers as *Irenaeus* and *Tertullian*, who were the first that mentioned that Rule of Faith, especially since they are conformable to these Notions of the anient Synagogue, and to the Writings of the New Testament.

But have we not reason to admire the Fickleness of *M. N.*'s Judgment in letting himself discover a mighty Secret for an opportunity of shewing his Criticks? He tells us there are shrewd Presumptions, that to the Institution of Baptism by our Saviour in the Gospel of *St. Matthew*, these words have been added, *In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*. What are those Presumptions? He tells us only this one; It appears in the *Acts*, and Epistles of the Apostles, that the Apostles never baptized in that form of words, but only in the name of the Lord Jesus. But who told him that those words, *In the name of Jesus*, were the form in which they baptized? I should have thought those words had signified no more than baptizing them to be Disciples of Jesus, as baptizing

into Moses, or baptizing in the name of Paul, signifies no more than baptizing them to be the Disciples of *Moses* or of *Paul*. And if these words were not the very form of Baptism, how can he say, that, those other words, which Christ prescribed as his form, were never used by the Apostles, and therefore these words were foisted into the Gospel of *S. Matthew* by some Impostor? It would have been a very great satisfaction if he had told us whether he made this Discovery by comparing our *S. Matthew* with the *Nestorian* Copy, which is perhaps to be found in MS. in some Libraries. But this would be to ask too much of him; for though he will not allow us this form that is in *S. Matthew*, he doth at the same time admit of the Apostles Creed, which is really no more than that form of Baptism, or the Profession of believing in the Father, in the Son, and in the Holy Ghost, which they made before they were baptized.

That which he tells us of *S. Clement*, is altogether new. *Photius*, *Isidore*, and *Petrus*, and *Alvinius*, three great Critics, lament that *S. Clement* was only an *Unitarian*; because he gives the Person

Person of Jesus Christ but very mean Characters, and infinitely below those of Divinity. *M. N.* quotes some passages of *Clement*, which he thinks have nothing in them too high; and because *S. Clement* in his Epistle, where he quotes that glorious Description which *S. Paul* hath made in his first Chapter to the *Hebrews*, did not quote the 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12th Verses, where Jesus Christ is called God, and where the Creation of the World is ascribed to him; tho' *M. N.* pretends that a convenient Solution may be put upon these words of *S. Paul*, yet he boldly affirms that it appears *S. Clement* acknowledged nothing in Christ more than Humanity; and that these five Verses of the first Chapter of the Epistle to the *Hebrews* might well have been added by the like fraud, that hath been used in many places of the Epistles and Gospels. His reason for it is, that *S. Clement*, who is said to have interpreted the Epistle of *S. Paul* to the *Hebrews*, could not be ignorant of the great Title of *Jesus Christ*, and would without doubt have expressed it, if he had designed to extol the Dignity of the Person of our Saviour.

What a heap of false Suppositions is this? First, it is false that *Photius* believed *S. Clement* to be an Unitarian. It is possible, that *Photius* might not observe in reading *S. Clement's* Epistle, that he treats *Jesus Christ* as *God*. But if *Photius* did not give all the attention that he could in reading, doth it follow from thence that *Clement* was an Unitarian? We have by good fortune *S. Clement's* Epistle preserved to us, and we may judge of it our selves: when he wisheth, *The Grace of God, and his Peace, may be multiplied through Jesus Christ, to them of Corinth*; and adds at the end, *the Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all*. What doth he mean, but that *Jesus Christ* may distribute the Grace of *God*? And is not that the Sense of *S. Paul*, who wisheth, *that Grace and Peace may be multiplied from God, and from Jesus Christ*?

§. 16.

When he saith, that our Lord *Jesus Christ*, who is the Scepter of the Majesty of *God*, did not come, *in regibus*, in the Pomp of Grandeur and Pride, as he well might; but with all humility, as the Holy Spirit had spoken of him *Isaiah LIII*; doth it not shew that he followed

followed the Description of S. Paul, who tells the *Philippians*; that our Lord Jesus Christ being in the form of God, thought it no robbery to be equal with God, or did not affect to seem equal with God, but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a Servant? Doth not this shew, that, according to S. Clement, our Lord Jesus Christ was in being before he chose the form in which he appeared?

How can M. N. who doth not believe that we ought to adore or call upon Jesus Christ, reconcile this Expression of S. Clement, *ἡ μὲν οὖν ἡμεῖς ἱεροῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν τῷ αἵματι τῆς ἡμετέρας σωτηρίας*, &c. 'Let us pray to our Lord Jesus Christ, whose Blood was given for us? For this *ἐν τῷ αἵματι* properly signifies the Prayers that are made to God with adoration.

§. 22.

What doth Clement mean, when he saith that Jesus Christ was born of Abraham according to the flesh? Doth it not appear that he was well acquainted with S. Paul's distinction, *Rom. IX. 5. Whose are the Fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever, Amen?*

§. 32.

I don't mention that which he saith in §. 26. where he quotes the first of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, where *S. Paul*, who follows the terms of *Wisdom*, VII. 26. exalts him above the Angels, as being the Son of God, and ascribes to him an Empire over all things, such as is described in *Pf. CX.* of which Empire no Creature is capable.

But I would fain know of what sort of *Unitarians M. N.* will have *Clement* to have been? was he an *Ebionite*? No. For he is continually quoting the Writings of *S. Paul*, which the *Ebionites* rejected. Was he a *Nazaren*? No. For he quotes not only *S. Matthew's* Gospel according to our Greek Copy, but also the other Gospels, except *S. John's*; which was not then written. Was he a *Corinthian*? No. For he quotes the Writings of the Old Testament. Sure this must have been a strange sort of *Unitarian*.

I know very well that *M. N.* observes that the title of *Chief Priest* is the most glorious Character that *Clement* gives to Jesus Christ, in his first Epistle to the *Corinthians*, which is that we speak of. But after all, he ought not to be
igno-

rant, that that title in the stile of the
best Christians, as well as the ancient
Jews, was the title of the *Asa*. This
may be proved from several places of
Philo. But I shall content my self with
quoting this one. *Ceterum illi anglo-*
lorum principi Sermoni antiquissimo hoc
extrema donum concessis Pater Omnispo-
tens, et in consilio stans, facturam a fa-
ctore discernere. Idem supplex immortalem
appellat pro moreationis doctorem, & a
sancto rege legatione ad subditos fungitur.
Quod donum tam libenter accepit, ut jactet
etiam, dicens, & ego steteram medius inter
vos & dominum, videlicet nec ingenuus
ut Deus, nec genitus ut vobis, sed inter ex-
terna media, apud utrosque agens obse-
dem; apud Creatorem, ut fides fiat nun-
quam tam doctorem aut deferentem uni-
versum genus relictum in perturbationem
ab ordine; apud creaturam vero, ut en-
cium spem habeat, nunquam Deo propitio
carum operis sui desere. Nam ego denuncio
ordina pacem ab eo qui bellum tollit Deo,
pacem custodit perpetuam.

Quis rerum
divin. har.
p. 509. B.C.

Secondly, it is not true, that the Epi-
stle to the Hebrews was written origi-
nally in Hebrew, though some of the
Ancients have thought so upon a very
light

light conjecture, because, say they, he must have written in Hebrew to those who were Hebrews by birth. One needs but read it attentively, and compare *Rom. 12.* with *Heb. 10.* and *Heb. 1.* with *Coloss. 1.* to see, that it is an Original, and that it was written by *S. Paul* himself, as well as his other Epistles. No Man of Judgment, except *M. N.* could have thought otherwise, supposing that the *Nazarens*, to whom the Epistle to the *Hebrews* was directed, were so numerous in the East, because it highly reflects upon them to have lost the Original Tongue of that very Epistle, which was written to their Forefathers, and to have kept only the *Greek Copy* of it.

Thirdly, it is the highest presumption to conclude, because *S. Clemens* quotes only that which goes before, and that which follows in the first Epistle to the *Hebrews*, that those five Verses were soisted in after the Epistle was spread abroad and better known. At this rate of judging by Quotations, one that would take the pains to observe, might reject a great part of the Bible, and we could not be certain of any.

But

But saith *M. N.* the Epistle to the *Hebrews* was not reckoned a genuine piece of Scripture any where in the West, nor in many Churches in the East before the end of the fourth Century; and that might have made it the more easie to have been corrupted. In this he shews what it is to meddle with things that he doth not understand. It can't be denied, and this very Writer acknowledges, that *Clemens Romanus* quoted this Epistle, in the Epistle which he writ in the name, and by the order of the Church of *Rome*; so that by his own confession it was owned in the West in the Apostles times.

Irenaeus, who also writ in the West, quotes the Epistle to the *Hebrews*: *Tertullian* and *S. Cyprian*, who lived in *Africa*; all these quoted it as Canonical. But to put this matter out of question, *S. Peter* the Apostle is a Witness above all exception to prove that *S. Paul* writ an Epistle to the *Hebrews*.

That which made several of the Antients doubt of its Authority towards the middle of the third Century, was the business of the *Novatians*, who made

made use of its Authority to justify their refusing to admit to publick Penance such as had fallen into Idolatry to avoid persecution. But after all, if one seriously considers *M. N.*'s method, it tempts one to wish that he was sent to preach the Gospel to the *Mahometans*, of whom some maintain, (as well as he) that the Gospels and Epistles have been corrupted by the Christians in many places, and that the Christians have sited in what they pleased that made for their opinions.

Now for another instance of *M. N.*'s honesty, where Dr. Bull hath quoted a place in *Clement's* second Epistle to the *Corinthians*, that might have solved the Objection. Ἀδελφοὶ οὕτως δὲ ἡμᾶς
 θεωρεῖν πρὸς Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ, ὡς πρὸς Θεῷ,
 ὡς πρὸς κριτὴν ζώντων καὶ νεκρῶν. The
 words signify, Brethren we ought so to
 think of Jesus Christ as of God, as of
 the Judge of the quick and the dead.
 There can no other Sense be put upon
 them, though *M. N.* saith they must
 be thus translated: Brethren we ought
 to think of Christ, as we do of God,
 namely, that he also is our Judge: If
 it is want of skill in the Greek that
 makes

makes *M. N.* commit such Error, and rail so at *Dr. Bull* for his own Ignorance; let the *Socinians* look them another Champion, for there is no Grammarian but will say he deserves to be whipt for construing it so. *us* and *us* are said of the same Person, if I know any thing of Grammar. *Photius* understood it as *Dr. Bull* hath, and *M. N.* thinks *Photius* sincere. But what need we care whether *Photius* was a good Grammarian or no. Doth not *Clemens* explain himself about the Preexistence of Christ, when he saith, Jesus Christ who hath saved us, being first a Spirit, and afterwards becoming flesh, and so he hath called us? No, saith *M. N.* let the Grammar be how it will, the Scriptures declare that Jesus Christ is Judge because he is a Man. Poor Man! Could he be capable of judging, that is to say, of knowing the Hearts, if he was but a Man? It is not said simply, as *M. N.* pretends it is, that Jesus Christ is to judge because he is a Man, but because he is the Son of Man, by Excellence; he that is described by *Daniel* in the VIIth of his Prophecies, that is the *Messias*, who was to be so, the

S. 10.

the Son of Man, as to be also the Son of God.

CHAP. V.

That the Nazarens, the Ebionites, the Minxans and the Alogians, were justly looked upon as Hereticks.

I Am now come to the *Nazarens*, the *Ebionites*, the *Mineans* and the *Alogians*; whom *M. N.* represents to us as the true Depositories of the Faith of the Apostles: And he endeavours to perswade us, that the Fifteen first Bishops of *Jerusalem*, and *Hegesippus*, who calls them Orthodox, and all the Bishops and People in the World that were in their Communion, were true *Unitarians*.

Dr. Bull having acknowledged, that if the Jews, who were converted by Jesus Christ and the Apostles in *Judea*, and who continued their Assemblies till the destruction of *Jerusalem*, did not

not own the Divinity of Jesus Christ, but believed him a meer Man, that Question is at an end between the Socinians and us. *M. N.* sets himself to prove; First, that the first Christians were called *Nazarens* and *Minaans* in *Judea*. Then he proves from *Epiphanius*, that the *Cerinthians* who observed the Law of *Moses*, and the *Nazarens* began at the same time. He saith, that the *Ebionites* were the same with them, only they had a different name; because, tho' some of them believed Jesus to be born of the Virgin and of *Joseph*, and the rest acknowledged him to be conceived of the Holy Ghost without *Joseph*, they still agreed that he was but a meer Man, which was the reason of *Origen's* saying that all the Jews that believed Jesus Christ to be the *Messias* were called *Ebionites*. From all this he concludes, that the first Disciples of Jesus Christ, and of the Apostles, rejected the Doctrine of the Divinity of Jesus Christ, and that the Body of these *Nazarens*, under the Government of the Fifteen first Bishops of *Jerusalem*, preserved the true Faith of the Apostles touching

F

the

the Son of Man, as to be also the Son of God.

CH A. P. V.

That the Nazarens, the Ebionites, the Minxans and the Alogians, were justly looked upon as Here-ticks.

I Am now come to the *Nazarens*, the *Ebionites*, the *Mineans* and the *Alogians*; whom *M. N.* represents to us as the true Depositories of the Faith of the Apostles: And he endeavours to perswade us, that the Fifteen first Bishops of *Jerusalem*, and *Hege-sippus*, who calls them Orthodox, and all the Bishops and People in the World that were in their Communion, were true *Unitarians*.

Dr. Bull having acknowledged, that if the Jews, who were converted by Jesus Christ and the Apostles in *Ju-dea*, and who continued their Assemblies till the destruction of *Jerusalem*, did not

not own the Divinity of Jesus Christ, but believed him a meer Man, that Question is at an end between the Socinians and us. *M. N.* sets himself to prove; First, that the first Christians were called *Nazarens* and *Minaans* in *Judea*. Then he proves from *Epiphanius*, that the *Cerinthians* who observed the Law of *Moses*, and the *Nazarens* began at the same time. He saith, that the *Ebionites* were the same with them, only they had a different name; because, tho' some of them believed Jesus to be born of the Virgin and of *Joseph*, and the rest acknowledged him to be conceived of the Holy Ghost without *Joseph*, they still agreed that he was but a meer Man, which was the reason of *Origen's* saying that all the Jews that believed Jesus Christ to be the *Messias* were called *Ebionites*. From all this he concludes, that the first Disciples of Jesus Christ, and of the Apostles, rejected the Doctrine of the Divinity of Jesus Christ, and that the Body of these *Nazarens*, under the Government of the Fifteen first Bishops of *Jerusalem*, preserved the true Faith of the Apostles touching the

F the

the Person of Jesus Christ; that is as much as to say, they held the Opinion of the *Unitarians*.

It is not necessary to repeat what I have formerly said of the *Minicans*, from the Testimony of S. *Jerom* in his 89th. Epistle to S. *Austin*, that they were in the Synagogue, and that they were not a Body of Christians. I shall only take notice, that the Name of *Minim*, that is to say, *Hereticks*, was never originally given to any People, Sect, or Party of Christians. It was the Name which the Pharisees gave to the Jews that were Sadducees: Afterwards the Pharisees gave it to those that rejected their Traditions, whom they looked upon as Hereticks for that reason. Afterward the Jews gave that Name to the Christians, because in teaching that Jesus was God they seem'd to destroy the capital Article of the Jewish Religion, which is the Unity of God. But most particularly they gave that name to such Christians, as, tho' they continued in Communion with them, did nevertheless acknowledge Jesus to be the *Messias*.

And

As for the *Nazarens*, I acknowledge that the Christians were at first called by that Name in *Judaea*: But I deny that those, whom they afterwards called *Nazarens* or *Ebionites*, were the Body of the Apostles Disciples, that were established at *Jerusalem* or in *Palestine*.

To convince *M. N.* of this, I desire he will consider: First, That those who followed the Doctrine of the Apostles in *Palestine*, were indeed called *Nazarens*, but only by the Jews; because they acknowledged Jesus of *Nazareth* for the *Messias*, whom the Jews looked upon as a false Prophet. It is in this sense that they call the Disciples of Jesus Christ *Hereticks*, and their Doctrine an *Heresie*. [*Act*, 24. 14.] In this sense they have continued to call the Christians *Nazarens* in that Curse which they pronounce in the Synagogue against all Christians, as *Justin Martyr* saith [against *Trypho* p. 323.]

But this Name of *Nazarens* came afterward to have another signification among the Christians, as may be seen in the ancient Writers. And this begun without doubt after the Disciples of Jesus Christ were called *Christians*,

stians, which was first at *Antioch*, as *St. Luke* tells us, in the *Acts*.

And indeed we do not see that the *Nazarens* were known after that time except among the Jews, who called the *Christians* so by way of reproach. *Tacit. An. 15.* calleth them *Christians* hat were persecuted at *Rome* by *Nero* in the Year of our Lord 64. After that, *Nero* made Laws against them by the name of *Christians*. *Pliny* speaks of the *Christians* in *Bithynia* in *Trajan's* time. The Emperour *Hadrian* sent a Writing to *Minucius Fundanus* Pro-consul of *Asia*, in favour of the *Christians*. The Author of the Epistle to *Diognetus*, which is among the Works of *Justin Martyr*, describes the Life of the *Christians*, but doth not call them *Nazarens*, yet he calleth himself a Disciple of the Apostles. *Justin Martyr* witnesses that even all the Hereticks took the general name of *Christians*. And those whom *Barchocba* persecuted in *Palestine* are called *Christians*: But they are never called *Nazarens* by *Justin Martyr*, who describes the Jews cruelties against them. Where then were the *Nazarens*, who were so famous

Euf. H. E.
IV. 9, 10.

mous according to *M. N.* and who, if we may believe him, were the only true *Christians* in *Palestine*?

Epiphanius speaks of *Nazarens* as Hereticks; but he can't decide whether they believed *Jesus Christ* to be a meer Man, or to be God. Indeed *Irenaeus* doth not speak of these *Nazarens*, whom he would not have forbore to call *Hereticks*, believing as he did the Divinity of *Jesus Christ*, if they had denied it in his time, and especially if they had made any considerable Body. *Eusebius* saith nothing of them. *S. Jerom* mentions them in his Treatise of *Ecclesiastical Writers*, but doth not tell us their Opinions. *Theodoret* saith, that the *Nazarens*, and the *Ebionites* were Hereticks, that appeared under the Reign of *Domitian*. It is plain, that these ancient Doctors would not have been at such a loss to shew the Belief of the *Nazarens*, if there had been great Churches through all *Asia*, as *M. N.* imagines. For these Fathers would (without doubt) have known these *Nazarens*, and would have learnt their Opinions from the Books of their Authors.

Hæc. 29.
Sect. 9.

C. 4.

The Fathers vindicated

2dly. The primitive Names, such as that of *Nazarens*, are not always a mark of Succession in Doctrine. No one doubts that the Apostles Disciples were first called *Christians* at *Antioch*; and yet *M. N.* must acknowledge, that the *Christians* at *Antioch* and all over the World, held the same Faith with his pretended *Nazarens* at *Jerusalem*. How then should it come to pass, that *Paulus* of *Samosata*, Bishop of *Antioch*, should be condemned as an Heretick; who according to *M. N.* was a true *Nazaren*.

3dly. How chanceth it that *M. N.* doth not observe what *Epiphanius* saith, that the *Cerinthians* and the *Nazarens* began at the same time? If by the *Nazarens* *M. N.* understandeth the first Disciples of the Apostles at *Jerusalem*, they began immediately after our Saviour's Ascension, and not under the Reign of *Domitian*. As for the *Cerinthians*, *Epiphanius* assures us, that they began at *Antioch* a little before the Decree of *Jerusalem*, that is to say, about Seventeen years after our Saviour's Ascension. For if we may believe *Epiphanius*, it was against *Cerinthus's* Doctrines, that the Assembly was held at
Jerusa-

Jerusalem. But after all, the antient Tradition which is delivered by *Irenaeus* from the mouth of *Polycarp*, saith, that *Cerinthus* was rejected at *Ephesus* by *S. John*; probably after his return from *Patmos*, that is after the Year of our Lord 96.

Lib. III.
c. 3.

4thly. How can *M. N.* reconcile all this with what he says, that the Apostles Creed was the rule of Faith in this Primitive Church? Were the *Ebionites* or the *Symmachians* (who believed Jesus Christ to be born of *Joseph* and *Mary*) also of the Body of the Apostolical Church, and reckoned true *Nazarens*? This was a strange Communion. The *Ebionites* had the Apostles Creed. Then they believed Jesus Christ to be conceived of the Holy-Ghost, and born of the Virgin *Mary*, and notwithstanding communicated with such, as believed Jesus Christ to be born of *Joseph* and *Mary*.

Orig. I. v.
p. 272. &
274.

5thly. Is *M. N.* in earnest when he saith, That *Origen* maintains that all the Jews who acknowledged Jesus Christ to be the *Messias* were called *Ebionites*, and that the *Ebionites* are *Nazarens*, and consequently the antient School of the Apostles? Hath he forgot that

Orig. *against* Cels.
L. V. p.
272.

Origen accounted the *Ebionites* to be Hereticks? *M. N.* is forced to acknowledge that he accounted them such; and so he calls them and distinguishes them from the Church.

L. III. c. 26.

Against
Cels. L. V.
p. 274.
Hæret. Fa-
bul. L. II.
c. 1.

6thly. What doth *M. N.* think of, when he condemns *Epiphanius* for saying that the *Ebionites* rejected *S. Paul's* Epistles, and called him an Apostate? Doth not *Irenæus* say the same thing. And *Origen* in his piece against *Celsus*? The like is also related by *Theodoret*.

7thly. I should be glad to know, if the *Nazarens*, or the *Ebionites*, or the *Cerinthians* were the same with those in the Apostles times, whom the Jews called *Nazarens*. Why doth not *M. N.* receive the Gospel of the *Nazarens*, and why doth he reject it, as Apocryphal and Superstitious. Did these first Christians, who ought to have served for a Pattern to all others, invent a Gospel that was rejected by the other Sects?

8thly. It would be well if *M. N.* would let us know how *S. Matthew's* Gospel, such as we have it with the Genealogy of Jesus Christ, and *S. Luke's* Gospel came to be received as Canonical;

nical, after they had been rejected as supposititious Peices by the *Ebionites* and the *Symmachians*, who were both of them *Nazarens*?

9thly. How came it to pass that the *Ebionites*, that is, the true *Unitarians*, continued in Communion with the *Cerinthians*, who affirmed that S. *John's* Gospel was written by *Cerintus*, and not by S. *John* the Evangelist?

But it is time now to undeceive *M. N.* if it be possible, and to give him a more faithful Account of the *Cerinthians*, and of the *Ebionites*, than that which he hath set before us. See what *Irenæus* saith of them. *Cerintus* asserted, that the World was not made by God, but by a certain Virtue wholly different, and very far from that Principality which is over all things, and which knew nothing of the God that is over all. As for Jesus Christ, he believed it impossible that he should be born of a Virgin, and therefore taught that he was born of *Joseph* and *Mary* like other men; tho' he did excell other men in Prudence and in Wisdom. He saith, that the Christ descended upon Jesus, from the Principality

L. I. c. 23.

lity which is over all things, in the Likeness of a Dove, and then Jesus Christ revealed the Father, who before was not known; and that at last Christ, who was not capable of suffering, forsook Jesus, and left him to suffer Death.

For the *Ebionites*, their Doctrines were not altogether so impious, but they received no other Gospel but *S. Matthew's*, and rejected the Apostle *S. Paul* as an Apostate. They observed all the Ceremonies of the Law, and lived as Jews, and adored *Jerusalem*, as being the house of God. This is what *Irenaeus* saith of them; who also ascribes to them the Belief that Jesus Christ was born of *Joseph* and *Mary*; which was common to them with the *Cerinthians*: And saith that in this they followed the Doctrine of *Aquila*, and of *Theodotion*. If there was any of them afterward, who believed Jesus Christ to have been conceived of the Holy Ghost without *Joseph*, they must have received this Belief after *Tertullian's* time. For he speaks of them as *Irenaeus* doth.

Ibid. L. I.
c. 26.

LIII. c. 24.

*De carne
Christi,*
p. 12.

How can *M. N.* forbear blushing for
his

his Folly, in looking on these People as the Disciples of Jesus Christ and his Apostles, and affirming that the Christian Church was composed of such execrable Wretches? Could such as these receive the Apostles Creed? Could they look upon the Apostles as their Masters? Could they pass for Christians in the Judgment of any Man, that is himself a Christian? *M. N.* ought to think himself obliged to those that defend the Trinity, and the God-head of our Saviour, for having delivered the World from these people, who rejected the most Sacred Principles of the Christian Faith; and for having preserved to the Evangelists and Apostles the right which Jesus Christ had given them of being the Teachers of his Religion.

As for the pretended Gospel of *S. Matthew*, which was in the hands of the *Nazarens*, it is easie to convince *M. N.* that he hath spoken at random when he builds so many things upon what he had heard of it. If he had been acquainted with *S. Jerom* his Works, he would have found some Quotations out of that Gospel of the *Nazarens*,

Nazarens, which would have undeceived him. S. *Jerom* cites that Gospel in *Ezek.* 16. in *Isai.* 8. and in *Matth.* 13. and brings these words, as the words of our Saviour; *Modo me arripuit mater mea, Spiritus Sanctus.* Now my Mother the Holy Ghost hath possessed me. I am sure *M. N.* will never find these words in the true Gospel of S. *Matthew.* And for the sense of them, as it depends upon the knowledge of the Jewish Tradition, which *M. N.* condemns and despises so much, it will be a Riddle to him for ever; although they are easily understood by those who are acquainted with the Jewish Notions.

After all, when *M. N.* is pleased, to make all the Christians that came out of the Synagogue to be called *Ebionites*, and grounds his Assertion upon a passage of *Origen*, who saith, that those among the Jews, who received Jesus Christ for the *Messias* are, called *Ebionites*; he imposes upon his Reader. For *Origen* doth not say, that these Jews left the Synagogue to make separate Assemblies. What Author ever did say so? *Origen* speaks of people that

Ibid. L. II.
P. 56.

Ib. Contr.
Cels. L. II.

tha
go
in
An
his
to
ftia
hav
the
Ebi
Syn
it.
Jesu
to

Tha
F
m
th
th
as

IT
H
who

that

that lived in the Body of the Synagogue; much like what S. *Jerom* saith in the passage that I have quoted. And indeed *Origen* exposes *Celsus* for his ignorance, in making a Jew speak to Jews that were converted to Christianity, otherwise then he ought to have done, for want of knowing that these Jews whom the Christians called *Ebionites* continued in the Body of the Synagogue, and observed the Laws of it. Tho' otherwise they confessed that Jesus Christ was the *Messias* promised to their Nation.

Jer. Ep. 89.
ad Aug.

CHAP. VI.

That neither *Hegesippus*, nor the Fifteen first Bishops of Jerusalem, were of the opinion of the *Cerinthians*, or the *Ebionites*: And that the *Alogi* were Hereticks as well as the *Cerinthians*.

IT is easie to be judged from all this; how solidly *M. N.* refutes Dr. *Bull*, who maintains from a passage in *Hegesippus*

gesippus that the Fifteen first Bishops of *Jerusalem* were Orthodox, and acknowledged the Divinity of Jesus Christ; and that all the other Bishops in the World, and particularly those of *Rome* were Orthodox, because they held Communion with the Bishops of *Jerusalem*.

M. N. pretends on the other side :
1st. That *Hegesippus* in his accounts of Hereticks, doth not account the *Cerinthians* and the *Ebionites* among the Hereticks : From whence it follows that he did not think them Hereticks, but Orthodox, and therefore *Hegesippus* was himself of their Opinion.

2^{dly}. That this appears, because *Hegesippus* was a Jew by Nation ; that all the Jews converted to Christianity being *Ebionites*, according to *Origen*, *Hegesippus* was also a *Nazarene* or an *Ebionite* ; and that the *Nazarenes* being accounted by *Hegesippus* to be Orthodox therefore the Fifteen first Bishops of *Jerusalem* must have been *Nazarenes*, and that all the rest of the Christian World was *Nazarene*, because in Communion with them.

It is enough to put one out of Patience

tience to have such a Man to deal with. *M. N.* saith *Hegesippus* was an *Ebionite*, that is, denied the Divinity of Christ. What Proof does he bring for this? He was originally a Jew. I will grant it him if he pleases. And that *Hegesippus* mentions *S. Matthew's Gospel* in Hebrew: I grant that also. But what then? Will *M. N.* from thence infer, that *Hegesippus* was an *Ebionite*? That is a small piece of Sophistry. The *Ebionites*, who were Jews of the Synagogue, had in Hebrew a Book which they called *S. Matthews Gospel*; but it was not the same that we all now make use of. For the *Ebionites* had taken the liberty to cut off the genealogy of our Saviour, and what else they pleased out of *S. Matthews Gospel*; and had added to it what they thought fit, as I have shewn by *S. Jerom* his Testimony. And because *Hegesippus* was a Jew by Birth, that he was therefore an *Ebionite*: What a consequence is this? He was not a Jew of the Synagogue, but a Christian, by profession; and he might as well make use of the pretended *S. Matthew's Gospel* in Hebrew, as *S. Jerom* could translate it into Latin without being an *Ebionite*.

2dly. He-

Secondly, *Hegesippus* convers'd at Rome with *Anicetus*, *Eleutherus*, and *Soter*, and found them of the same opinion with the fifteen first Bishops of *Jerusalem*: So according to *M. N.* all the other Bishops in the World, who were in their Communion, were *Ebionites* and *Nazarens*. If this consequence were good, I wonder how *Hegesippus* came to say, that the Church was pure from Heresie no longer than till the beginning of the second Century. He ought to have said that the Church had preserved her virginity till this time, that is till the year 170. Whereas he saith expressly, that the Hereticks peep'd out of their holes, and began to corrupt the Apostles Doctrine immediately after their Deaths.

Thirdly, If *Hegesippus* did not take the *Cerinthians* for Hereticks, how came it to pass that he continued for so long a time in Communion with the Roman Bishops, namely with those three great Bishops *Anicetus*, *Eleutherus*, and *Soter*? For that these Bishops accounted them Hereticks, it sufficiently appears from *Irenaeus*, who accounted them Hereticks; and was not in Communion

nion only, but in high esteem with those three Bishops, as well as was *Pothinus* Bishop of *Lions*, whom he succeeded in his Bishoprick.

But, saith *M. N. Hegesippus*, giving an account of the Hereticks of his time, did not reckon the *Cerinthians* among them; and *Valesius* was in the wrong to insert the words, *Et alii*, to take them in. But herein *M. N.* betrays his Ignorance as well as his Rashness. *Hegesippus* speaks of the Sects that were among the Jews before Jesus Christ, and shews that from them arose several Hereticks among the Christians: Such as the *Simonians*, the *Menandrians*, the *Marcionites*, the *Carpocratians*, the *Valentinians*, the *Basilidians*, and the *Saturnilians*. Was he obliged to speak of all the Hereticks, when he was only speaking of those which owed their Original more immediately to the Heresies of the Synagogue?

But besides, it is easie to convince *M. N.* of the falseness of his position, as to *Hegesippus* his Belief.

First, It is certain that he came to Rome in the time of *Anicetus*, who began in the year 150, and he lived there

L. IV. c. 2. at *Rome* to the time of *Eleutherus*, who began in 170, and died in the year 185. This is what *Eusebius* tells us, that *Hegesippus* himself witnesseth. He declares that he lived in the Communion of the Church of *Rome*, and of its Bishop. Now this Bishop was of the same opinion with *Irenaeus*, who was in Communion with him, and who reckoned the *Cerinthians* and the *Ebionites* to be Hereticks; therefore *Hegesippus* reckoned them Hereticks as well as *Irenaeus* did.

Secondly, It is certain that *Justin Martyr*, who died at *Rome* under persecution, was always lookt upon as Orthodox in the Questions about the Nature of Jesus Christ. Now he is the first that treated of Heresies, and writ an History of their Authors. He witnesseth it himself in his Apology. Those that came afterward, as *Irenaeus* who writ against Heresies in *Eleutherus's* time, as appears from himself; and *Hippolytus*, who as far as we can judge followed him, did but copy from *Justin*. Now it is certain that *Irenaeus* and *Hippolytus* accounted the *Cerinthians* and the *Ebionites* Hereticks after *Justin Martyr*. Therefore the Church of

Et in Euf.
H. E. IV. 2.

L. III. c. 3.

of Rome, in which *Irenaeus* and *Hippolytus* lived for many years in great credit, and consequently *Hegesippus* accounted the *Cerinthians* and the *Ebionites* Hereticks.

To avoid this consequence, it must be supposed that the Church of Rome changed its opinions all on a sudden after *Hegesippus* his departure from Rome; that *Irenaeus* changed in like manner, with all the Christian *Gentles*; that those who were Orthodox in *Justin Martyr's* time, became all of them Hereticks, in the space of fifteen or sixteen years; and that, when a small difference among the Western Churches about *Easter-day* had troubled the peace of the Church, and given occasion for several Assemblies of the Bishops to compose this difference, all the Churches changed their Faith almost in a night, without perceiving it, without making the least reflection, or being at all moved: The *Catechists* changed their Instructions to the *Catechumens*; the Bishops the stile of their *Sermons*, and of their Christian *Common Prayers*; those that writ against the Jews and the Pagans altered all their Ideas, and the

whole method of the Controversie: All the People changed the form of their Prayers; and in a word, that all went to bed, *Ebionites* and *Cerinthians*, and did awake in the opinions of *Justin Martyr*; and all this when most part of them had never heard of *Justin Martyr's* Books, nor of his Conference with *Trypho* the Jew, in which *M. N.* saith that he advanceth new Hypotheses about the Person of our Saviour Jesus Christ.

We are now come to the *Alogi*, whom *M. N.* takes for the Christians that were converted from Pagans, as those that were converted from Jews according to him were *Nazarens*. So taking into the number of the old *Unitarians*, all those that were converted by Jesus Christ and his Apostles. He supposes then that they bore the name of *Alogi*, because they denied the *Logos* or *Word*, of which *S. John* speaks.

Epiphanius is the first that hath mentioned the *Alogi*; and he gave them that name of his own head, as he declares twice in his Refutation of them; and, as *M. N.* himself acknowledgeth. *Epiphanius* tells us that they appeared
 after

after the *Quartodecimans*; that is, after the year of our Lord 190. They adopted the opinions of *Cerintus* and *Ebion*, which had made Jesus Christ to be a meer Man, and to be born of *Joseph* and *Mary*. Against which opinions *S. John's Gospel* and his *Epistles* were written, as saith *Irenaeus*; and these pieces giving their Disciples some trouble, they set themselves to elude the force of them. First, to make the three first Gospels contradictory to *S. John's*, to destroy the authority of it. And, Secondly, they were so ridiculous as to assert that that Gospel and the Revelation were written by *Cerintus*, and not by *S. John*.

It is probable that *Epiphanius* would by this term of *Alogi*, intimate such Hereticks as rejected *S. John's Gospel* and the Revelation: both because they rejected the *λόγος*, and because they denied the Gifts of the Holy Ghost, and the Prophecie times promised in the Gospel. For *Irenaeus* speaks of certain Hereticks without naming them, of whom he saith: L. III. c. 2.
p. 259. C. D.

Alit vero ut donum Spiritus frustrentur quod in novissimis Temporibus secundum placitum Patris effusum est in humanum

genus, *Allam speciem non admittunt, quæ est secundum [Joannis] Evangelium, in qua Paracletum semissarium Dominus promissit simul & Evangelium, & Prophetarum repellunt spiritum. Infelices [verè] qui Pseudoprophetae quidem esse volunt, Prophetæ verò gratiam repellunt ab Ecclesia: Similia patientes his, qui propter eos qui in hypocrisi arriunt, præconia fratrum communicationis se abstinere. Datur autem intelligi, quod hujusmodi neque Apostolum Paulum recipiant. In ea enim Epistola quæ est ad Corinthios de Prophetis charismatibus diligenter loquutus est, & scit viros, & mulieres in Ecclesia prophetantes. Per hæc igitur omnia peccantes in spiritum Dei, in irremissibile incidunt peccatum.*

These however are the People that M. N. calls the body of the Pagans that were converted to Christianity. He represents them to us, as the body of the Church; and his proof for it is, because Theodotus about the year 190, forsook the party of the Platonick Christians, who believed the Preexistence of our Saviour, and joined himself to the Alogi. And after this, he spits his venom at Eusebius, for affirming that The-

odotus

odorus was the first that made Jesus Christ a meer Man.

What Injury hath poor *Eusebius* done to *M. N.*? He was according to *M. N.* a great *Unitarian*; though he calls *Paul* of *Samosata*, (the *Unitarians* Favourite) an Heretick and Disciple of *Artemon*. *Eusebius* hath not said one word of what *M. N.* ascribes to him concerning *Theodorus*: He only relates a pretty long passage out of an Author that had writ in the beginning of the third Century against the Heresie of *Artemon*, a famous *Unitarian*. This nameless Author saith that *Theodorus*, whom he looks upon as the first Author of the *Unitarians* Doctrine, was excommunicated by Pope *Victor*; from whence he infers that *Victor* was not of the *Unitarians* opinion as they supposed him to be, pretending that their Belief had been the general opinion of the Church, and of the Apostles Successors, until the time of *Victor* and of *Zephyrin*, Bishops of *Rome*.

*Apud Iul.
H.E. l. V.
c. 28.*

But how doth all this prove that the *Alogi* were the Pagans that were converted by the Apostles? They are People that rejected the Gospel of *St. John*,

his Revelations and Epistles, as the *Cerinthians* had done. That is, they were *Cerinthians*; or if you please they were those who are described by *Irenæus* as a sort of Hereticks. *Theodotus*, as *M. N.* truly saith, being excommunicated by *Victor*, went over to their party; what then? doth this prove that they were the body of the Church that were converted by the Apostles from among the Gentiles? It certainly shews that they resolved not to acknowledge the Godhead of Jesus Christ; and therefore thought they must reject the Gospel of *S. John*, and his other Writings. And yet they shewed more honesty in doing so than the *Socinians*, who have thought that they might receive *S. John's* Gospel, and yet deny the Divinity of Christ, which *Julian* the Apostate, confess'd to be clearly expressed by *S. John*.

After all, I cannot but wonder how *M. N.* can think of the choice of Witnesses that he hath made to confirm his System, without being ashamed of them himself. The *Nazarens* who were his converted Jews, received no other Gospel but that of *S. Matthew*, and that
very

very much adulterated. The *Ebionites*, who were another sort of his converted Jews, rejected all the Epistles of *S. Paul*. The *Alogi*, who were his Gentile-Converts, rejected all the Works of *S. John*. And all this for the Hundred and fifty first years of Christianity, and something longer. How then came the Books of the New Testament to be afterwards so well received at *Jerusalem*, and in *Judea*? And how came they to be after that so well known all over the World?

By *M. N.*'s reckoning, the *Trinitarians* that were born after *Justin Martyr*'s time, must have come and opened the eyes of the Apostolical Churches among the Jews, and also among the Gentiles; for it was by them that the Apostolical Books came to have their due authority. And therefore let *M. N.* magnify his Primitive *Unitarians* as much as he will, he shall never persuade any considering Man to believe, that they who made so bold with the Apostles, as to reject so many of their Books, did not also reject what they pleased of the Apostolical Doctrines; or that the Apostles Doctrines were not preserved by them

them that rescued out of the hands of those Hereticks so many of those Books which the *Socinians* do now acknowledge to be Divine Scriptures.

The last Monument or Remain of the Apostolical Succession, which agrees with the Socinian Doctrine concerning our Saviour, saith *M. N.* are the *Recognitions*, ascribed to *Clemens Romanus*. He calls the Author of these, an *Ebionite*; though he believeth it was a piece falsely put under the name of *Clement*. *M. N.* doth very well to shew his fair dealing in this. He hath rejected *Barnabas*, *Hermas*, and *Ignatius*, as supposititious Authors, and therefore of no authority in this Controversie. And yet now he gravely quotes these *Recognitions* as a monument of the Apostolical Succession. Is there not a great deal of Justice in this? But then, it seems, others of the Primitive *Unitarians* were Forgers, as well as *Cerinthus*; he was not the only Man of this trade, though perhaps he was the first of them; for he forged Revelations and Visions under the name of *S. John*, which gave the occasion to them, that as *M. N.* elsewhere observes, would have

have *Cerintus* to be the Author of the Revelation. Now here is another of their gang that forges a Book under the name of *Clemens*, the Disciple of the Apostles.

But how came *M. N.* to know that the Author of the *Recognitions* was an *Ebionite*? He tells us, he took *Dapin's* word for it. But he would have done better to have read the *Recognitions* himself, and then he would have seen that this Author favours the *Arians*, and not the *Ebionites*.

After this it appears with how much vanity, and how little reason, *M. N.* concludes all the Successors of the Apostles were *Unitarians*. He doth indeed quote a long passage of the Author that writ against the *Artemonites*, in the beginning of the third Century, who saith that those Hereticks had the insolence to affirm this: For they boast that their Doctrines continued in peaceable possession of the Churches that were planted by the Apostles, and by their Successors, till the times of *Victor* and of *Zephirin*.

But the same Author confutes them with several Arguments. 1. From the authority of Scripture. 2. From the Works

Works of some of the Fathers whom he quotes, such as *Justin, Miltiades, Tatian, Clemens of Alexandria, Irenaeus, and Melito*. Whereupon *M. N.* observes that *Justin* who lived in the middle of the second Century, is the first that he hath named; and from thence he infers that *Justin* was the first that set up the opinion of the Divinity of Jesus Christ. A pretty piece of Sophistry! as if the quoting of five or six of the Fathers who defended the Godhead of Jesus Christ before *Victor* and *Zephyrin's* time, was not amply enough to destroy the assertion of *Artemon*, which was the thing he designed to confute. If *Artemon* had been of his opinion, would not he have been a fool to put off the beginning of the Doctrine of our Saviour's Divinity to the time of *Victor*, who lived above thirty years after *Justin Martyr's* death?

C H A P. VII.

That Justin Martyr was no Innovator.

IT is nevertheless upon this ridiculous foundation, that *M. N.* endeavours to prove that *Justin Martyr* was the first that innovated; in affirming that it was the *λόγος* that appeared to the antient *Patriarchs* under the Old Testament, and that was called by the name of *Jehovah*; from whence he concludes the Pre-existence, and the Divinity of the *λόγος*, or Word.

To shew that *Justin* was an Innovator, and asserted this without ground, *M. N.* brings divers considerations upon several passages of the Old Testament, where it is said that *God appeared*, or that *God spoke*; in which passages the *Socinians* endeavour to prove that it was an *Angel*, and not *God* that is spoken of. And besides, he brings the authorities of some of the Antients, and late Writers,

Writers, that contradict *Justin Martyr* about these notions.

But he doth this with very little judgment: For the question is not, whether *Justin* brings some proofs to confirm the Pre-existence and Godhead of the Word, that the other Orthodox Fathers did not think fit to make use of; but whether *Justin* was the first that advanced this Doctrine among the Christians, being the product of his own Brain, and before unheard of. His Dialogue with *Trypho* plainly shews the contrary: It was writ about the year 149. He there sets forth the *Ebionites*, or the *Cerinthians*, as People that made no great body among the Christians; which would have been very important in one that had first brought up the opinion of the Godhead and Pre-existence of our Saviour: and the Jew would have laught at him for proposing to him the belief of a Doctrine that he had never heard of before from any other Christian.

But, in truth, that the Christians held this Doctrine of the Godhead of Jesus Christ was known to the Pagans, as appears by *Pliny's* Epistle to *Trajan*,
and

and the *Philopatris* that is among *Lucian's* works; where the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, and of the *Godhead of Jesus Christ*, and of the *procession of the Holy Ghost*, is set forth and explained by that scoffing Heathen, as distinctly as it is at this day by any Orthodox Divine; and it was known to the Jews to be an opinion of the Christians, and that a principal one; as appears by *Justin's Dialogue with Trypho*.

The Controversie between *M. N.* and the Church, turns upon this question, whether *Justin Martyr* was an Innovator or not; that is, whether the Doctrine of our Saviour's Pre-existence is the ancient Doctrine of the Apostles, and the Primitive Christians? Or whether we have abandoned the Faith of the Apostles and first Christians, and taken up a phantastical notion that was invented by *Justin Martyr*?

This question being of so great importance, ought to be considered with a more than ordinary attention. *Justin* presented his first Apology, which is the second in his Works now extant, to the Emperor *Pius* in the year of our Lord 139. He afterward writ his Dialogue

Dialog. 340. Dialogue against *Trypho*, which contains a dispute with a Jew about the truth of the Christian Religion. This appears, because in his Dialogue he speaks of his Apology. *Justin* lived at *Rome* afterward till he writ his second Apology, (the first in his Works) and in the year of our Lord 150. he suffer'd Martyrdom there, being prosecuted by *Crescens* an Heathen Philosopher.

Here is a Man of great eminence among the Christians of his time, who lived in the Metropolis of the Roman Empire in the times of *Hyginus*, *Pius*, and *Anicetus*, being Bishops there; and who was so far of their Communion, that his Pen served twice to stop the fury of two Persecutions by two famous Apologies that he wrote in behalf of the Christians.

In his first Apology, representing to the Emperor the Faith that was then profest by the Christians, he saith expressly, that they believed the *Trinity*, and also the Incarnation of the *Word*: which shews that it was not a new Doctrine, unheard of before that time, nor such as came then into *Justin's* head while

while he was writing his Dialogue with *Trypho*. It is also to be observed that this *Justin*, who defended the *Trinity*, in his Dialogue against *Trypho*, doth no less maintain the *Unity* of God, as he hath done also in his Treatise of *the Monarchy of God*; though our *Unitarians* can't tell how to reconcile this with the Doctrine of the *Trinity*.

He writ his Dialogue against *Trypho* about the year 140. For in that Dialogue he sheweth plainly, that the Jewish War was then but newly ended. He lived ten years after in the eye of the World, and writ several Books after this; so the Church could not but be fully acquainted with his opinions. But for all that, he continued peaceably in the Communion of those great Bishops, whom *M. N.* calls *Nazarens*, *Cerinthians*, and *Ebionites*, and his memory is still blessed among Christians.

But this is not all; for during his abode at *Rome* he lived in Communion with *Polycarp*, Disciple of *S. John*, who came thither under the

H

Em-

Emperor *Pius*, and was in Communion with the Roman Bishop *Anicetus*. He learnt (without doubt) from *Polycarp* the abhorrance which *S. John* had for *Cerinthus*, to that degree that he would not go into the House where *Cerinthus* was bathing, for fear it should fall upon their heads. He was also in Communion with *Hegesippus*, who came to *Rome* while *Anicetus* was Bishop there, and continued there till the time of *Eleutherus*. That there was an acquaintance between them, is more than probable. For *Justin*, though a Pagan before his conversion, was born in *Samaria* then called *Neapolis*; and *Hegesippus* was also a Native of *Palestine*. *Hegesippus* witnesseth that he communicated with *Anicetus*, with *Soter*, and with *Eleutherus*; and that then all the Churches were in the same Faith. After this, how can *Justin Martyr* be looked upon as an Innovator?

But to go to the bottom of *M. N's* System, let us consider it a little farther.

ther. *Justin* writ a Book against Heresies, which was the common store-house of all those Fathers that writ next after him upon that Subject; as *Irenaus*, *Hippolytus*, &c. Now these Writers agree in treating the *Cerinthians* and the *Ebionites* as pernicious Hereticks. See *Irenaus*, L. 1. c. 25, 26. and the Latin Dialogue of the Heresies that is in the end of *Tertullian's* Book of Prescriptions, which is but an Abridgment of the Book of *Hippolytus*. Now it is certain, that *Irenaus* as well as *Hegesippus* lived in Communion with the Roman Bishop *Easterus*, and *Eleutherus* had lived in Communion with the foregoing Bishops that had communicated with *Justin Martyr*; it follows therefore that in those times, *Justin* was never looked upon as an Innovator.

One needs but read the Dialogue with *Trypho*, to be satisfied that *Justin Martyr* defends in it the Doctrine of the Apostles, and of the whole Church till his time.

1st. When he represents his Conversion to Christianity, he tells us, that it was by the Instructions of an old Man whom he did not know, and whom he met with in a Solitary place, whither he was retired to meditate upon Philosophy.

2^{dly}. *Justin* reckons all those as Hereticks, who were distinguished by the Names of their Masters, without naming any: But there were none at that time whom this Character fitted better than the *Ebionites* and *Cerinthians*.

Just. p. 267.

3^{dly}. *Justin* (as I have said before) doth mention a sort of Dissenters among Christians, plainly meaning the *Ebionites*; and represents them as a very small number in comparison of the generality of Christians, that believed the Godhead of our Saviour.

P. 265,
7. 4.

4^{thly}. *Trypho* doth from the Unity of God raise an Objection against the belief of the Trinity that was acknowledged by the Christians, and looks upon the belief of that small number,

ber, namely of the *Ebionites*, to be the most consistent with reason.

5thly. If there had been no other Christians but *Ebionites*, at the time of this Conference of *Trypho* with *Justin*, nothing could have been more impertinent than *Trypho's* question, whether those that observed the Law, and withal acknowledged Jesus Christ to be the *Messias*, were capable of being saved? For the *Ebionites* did both observe the Law, and receive Jesus as the *Messias*. And they according to *M. N.* were the Body of the Christian Church. P. 253.

6thly It appears that the Christians went by no other Name in the time of *Justin*, then that of *Christians*: and not by that of *Nazarens*, as *M. N.* supposeth. Ib p. 287.

7thly. *Justin* doth every where lay it down for a Rule, that *Jesus Christ* is the Object of Divine Worship for all Christians.

8thly. *Trypho* derides Christian Religion in general, because it teaches the Incarnation of the Word in the Womb of the Virgin, whereas for his

part he should have thought it reasonable to have acknowledged him to be only a Man, who upon the account of his Justice had been raised to the Dignity of *Messias*.

Ib. p. 251,
292.

9thly. *Justin* doth generally speak with horror against divers Heresies that had then risen up against the Church according to our Saviours prediction.

Ib. p. 307,
308.

10thly. He constantly represents the Christians of his time, as being endowed with the gift of Miracles, and the power of casting out Devils in the Name of Jesus Christ, as of the true God. A Power, which we do not read that the *Ebionites* or *Cerinthians* ever had, or did ever pretend to it: And which *Irenaeus* made a distinguishing Character between the Catholick Church and all Heretical Assemblies.

P. 311.

Iren. L. IV.
p. 45.

11thly. *Justin* protests that the Christian Faith which he defends is the same that was spread all over the World, even in the most barbarous and unknown Countries; Which certainly he would not have dared

Just. M. di.
al. p. 343.

dared to affirm in the face of all Jews and Unitarians, if they could have disproved him, and especially if there had been so many Unitarian Churches as *M. N.* hath imagined.

Now when I look back upon all these Considerations, I can't persuade my self that *M. N.* hath ever read the Dialogue between *Justin* and *Trypho*. I rather believe that he hath read in *Eusebius*, that *Justin Martyr* was the most ancient Author that the Anonymous of the Third Century quoted, to prove the Doctrine of the Trinity and of the Godhead of the *Messias* was taught before the time of *Victor*, who excommunicated *Theodotus* of *Byzantium*; and that thereupon he imagined, though without ground, as I have shewed, that *Justin* was the Author of the Doctrine of the Trinity, and of the Divinity of our Saviour. And as *M. N.* is a Man of extraordinary Confidence, he thought he might venture this System abroad,

since it would be so highly acceptable to those of his Party, and would seem very specious to all others that could not gain-say, or that would not take the Pains to examine it.

The especial Charge against *Justin Martyr* is this, That he was the first that ventured to say, it was the λόγος that appeared to the Patriarchs and Fathers of the Old Testament, which according to the *Socinians* was either *God*, or an *Angel* that spake as Ambassador from God, and consequently as God. And if so, it then followeth that *Justin* was an Innovator.

But they are much mistaken in thinking that *Justin* advanceth any new thing in affirming the λόγος to be a Divine person, and in saying it was he that appeared to the Fathers, when he hath the Apostles before him, *S. Paul* in the first Chapter to the Hebrews, and *S. John* in the Preface of his Gospel, affirming that the λόγος, or Word, was God, and that it was he by whom the World was

was created, and without whom was not any thing made that was made.

He hath likewise, both in the one and in the other, followed the ancient Divinity of the Jews, such as we find it in the Writings of *Philo*, who writ before *S. Paul* and *S. John*; and in a time when the Jews had not invented the Evasions, which *Justin* reproaches them with in his Dialogue with *Trypho*. Now *Philo* doth positively affirm, That it was the *Word* who appeared to *Abraham* and to *Sarah*, and whom *Abraham* calls his *Lord*. He also affirms, that he was the same who appeared to *Hagar* in the Desert, and who changed the name of *Jacob* into *Israel*. Which *Word*, *Philo* indeed sometimes calls an *Angel*, but he calls him also the *Son of God*, begotten of God, and his first born. I shall quote the places in the next Chapter,

Gen. 18.

One would think that this being so well known to the Jews, as appears by so many several places in *Philo*,

Philo, M. N. might have spared his accusing the Christians of having foisted the name of *Christ* in the 9. Ver. of the X. Chapter of the 1. Epistle to the *Corinthians*, to confirm their Doctrine of the Pre-existence of *Jesus Christ*; whereas in the antient Copies it was, *Let us not tempt God*, as *Grotius* pretends it ought to be read according to the *Alexandrian Manuscript*.

M. N. confesseth that *Epiphanius* charges this upon *Marcion*, and not on the Orthodox Christians. But I do not see what reason *Epiphanius* could have to accuse *Marcion* of this; for *Irenaeus*, who was more antient than the *Alexandrian Manuscript*, hath quoted the passage in these Terms, *Let us not tempt Christ*; and surely *Irenaeus*, who is there disputing against the Heretick *Marcion*, whom he accuses of having falsified the Epistles of *S. Paul*, would take care not to use the Copies which *Marcion* had falsified.

2dly. Supposing in some Manuscript they had read the word *κύριον*,
as

Iren. IV.
35. p. 385.

L. I. c. 25.

as *Epiphanius* would have it instead of *Χριστον*, the mistake might easily be committed in Manuscripts where, in such common words they generally writ only the first Letters K or X with a *ν* over the Head. And is not the word *κύριος* sufficient to denote *Jesus Christ*, according to the ordinary Style of the New Testament? It is certainly so, according to *Epiphanius*, who saith, *Χριστον καὶ κύριον τὸν αὐτὸν ὁμολογεῖν*, that *Christ and Lord denote the same person*.

M. N. Will not allow of this gloss of *Epiphanius*; but he would oblige us in shewing that which *Epiphanius* did not; namely, what design of *Marcion's* it could serve, to change the term of *κύριος* into that of *Χριστον*; for it is not credible, he would corrupt the Text only for his pleasure, and not to serve any design, But this change was so far from serving *Marcion's* Hypothesis; that it would have been quite on the contrary. He denied that the God of the Old Testament was the Father

Father of *Jesus Christ*. He rejected the Old Testament, and could not endure it should be said, that the Jews were under the care and conduct of *Jesus Christ*, whom he set forth as the Author of a Gospel that was opposite to the Law and the Prophets. It was therefore contrary to his Design to make that corruption of the Text which *Epiphanius* charges him with by changing *Χριστός* into *Χριστός*, which overturned all these Principles. According to him the Jews never had any thing to do with *Jesus Christ*; but wholly depended upon the Creatour of Heaven and Earth, whom *Marcion* would not allow to be the Father of our Saviour *Jesus Christ*. And therefore to make the Apostle say, that the Jews tempted *Jesus Christ* in the Wilderness had been to make the Apostle speak against himself. It was with the some design that instead of reading, *but with many of them God was not well pleased*, he had put, *but Christ was not well pleased with many of them*. But he had not

not carried his falsification far enough, for which *Epiphanius* laughs at him, for he had left these terms that the *Rock was Christ*, which was sufficient to justify the reading of *Irenaeus*, *Let us not tempt Christ*, against the Authority of the *Alexandrian Manuscript*. This, I hope, is enough to shew with what rashness *M. N.* asserts, that it is only since the Council of *Nice*, that the Fathers have taken advantage of this corruption of *Marcion*.

CHAP. VIII.

That the Notion of the *Λόγος* did not come from the Platonicks, but was the antient Notion of the Synagogue, and of the Apostles of our Saviour.

WHAT I have said in general of the Doctrine of *Philo*, who was the most considerable of the Jews at *Alexandria*, and lived under *Caligula*, to whom he was sent by his Nation as their publick Agent or Orator, is sufficient to shew, that the Notion of the *Λόγος*, and of his appearings under the Old Dispensation, was no new Doctrine, nor first advanced by *Justin Martyr* in his Dialogue with *Trypho*.

Nevertheless *M. N.* either for want of due consideration, or in hopes of carrying it off by the help of his Criticks, doth obstinately maintain that

that *Justin's* Notion of the *λογος* is a *Platonick* Notion; and that though it was afterward adopted by some Christians, yet it was not known to the Apostles and their next Successors.

What *Dr. Bull* quotes from the Jewish Writers to prove, that the *λογος* was known to the Jews, is in no wise satisfactory to our Author. He saith that those Jews were all of them, either Phantastical *Cabalists*, or Commentators upon the Writings of the Old Testament; but Men of no Authority, or Persons obscure and unknown, such as *Rabbi Tanchuma*; or they were Christians that writ under the name of Jews, as the Author of the Books that go under the Name of *Philo*. Now let us see whether *M. N.* hath any ground for being so very confident.

The Notion of the *λογος*, saith *M. N.* is a *Platonick* Idea, that was adopted by some Christians. This is a very bold Assertion. He takes the Liberty to say what he pleases of

of Books, that go under the name of *Philo*, which I have already quoted: But all that he saith is meer Talk without Proof. And it were strange if all the World reject Books that have not been questioned for so many Ages, because an angry Man resolves to cry them down.

Let us but see what *Philo* saith of the Subject we now treat of, and then let any equitable Reader judge, whether *M.N.* hath reason to accuse *Justin Martyr* of having advanced *Platonick* Ideas, when he speaks of the *Logos*.

What follows, is the Doctrine of *Philo* concerning this Subject; which I have reduced to some Heads to avoid repetition; and I have quoted the several parts of his Works for it, which it would have been too tedious to transcribe.

He saith, that though, there be but one God, yet there are in him two Sovereign *Dynastes*, or Powers, his

his Goodness or Bounty, and his Pu-
 issance. His *Goodness* by which he
 hath created, and his *Puissance* by
 which he governs, and that the *λο-
 γος* or *Word* is a third Power, by which
 he unites those two other Powers:
 So that it is by the *Word*, that he
 is both powerful and good. And he
 saith, that the two *Cheru-
 bims* were the Symbols of
 this truth, (a)

a) Philo de Cher. p. 112.
 E. de consus. Ling. p. 327.
 de Migr. Abrah. p. 367. B.

He represents the Di-
 vine *Word*, as being infe-
 rior to God, but without
 being distant from God;
 and so being he that go-
 verns those two Divine
 Powers, both that which
 Creates and that which
 Rules, and so that governs
 all. Which, saith he, was
 typified by the Presence
 of God above the *Cheru-
 bims*. (b)

b) De profagi, p. 466.
 B. C. D.

He saith, that it was the
λογος or *Word*, that form-
 I ed

ed and created the World.

- c) De Mundi Opif. p. 4. (e) And that it was the
D. & p. 5. & p. 44. *λογος*, that was the Or-
gan of God to form the
World. (d)

- e) De Mundi Opif. p. 6. C. He calls the *λογος*, the
Image of God; (e) and saith
it was by him that he
formed the World, (f) and
that he governs it. (g)

- f) De Monar. L. II. p. 823.
g) De Migr. Abr. p. 389.

He affirms, That these
words, *Let us make man in our
own Image*, shew that God
took in others to work with
him. (h) and the Image of
God in Man is the Chara-
cter of the *λογος* or Word
which is eternal. (i)

- h) De Op. M. p. 16. C.
De conf. Ling. p. 336. &c.

- i) De Plant. Noe p. 217.
A.

He saith that the Soul
was formed after the Image
of the *λογος* or Word. (k)

- k) De Opif. Mund. p. 32.
E.

- l) De Migr. Abr. p. 389.
B. De Somniis p. 574. E.
& p. 575. B.

He saith, That the *λογος*
or Word, is as the house that
God dwells in. (l)

He

He shews plainly enough,
that in the VIII. of *Prov.* he
understood by the Wis-
dom of God there spoken
of, a *Person*, and not an
Attribute. (m) Where he
saith also, that it is the
λόγος, or *Word of God*. (n)

m) *Alleg. L. p. 48. Ap. 52.*
A, B.

n) *Ib. p. 54. E. & lib.*
quod deter. pot. infid. p.
165. C.

He saith, that the *Word*
is the *Interpreter* of God,
that he was begotten of
God, and that he giveth *Te-*
stimony to us from God. (o)

o) *Alleg. Leg. L. II. p. 99.*
D, E.

He saith, that the *Word*
is also called an *Angel*. (p)

p) *Ib. p. 39. D.*

He affirms, that it was
the *λόγος* or *Word*, that
appeared to *Abraham* and
to *Sarah*, *Gen. 24.* and
whom *Sarah* called my
Lord. (q)

q) *Ib. p. 121. D.*

He affirms, that it was
the *λόγος* that appeared to
Hagar in the *Desart*. (r.)

r) *De profug. p. 451. B.*
& de Somnis p. 600. D.

I 2 He

He saith, it was the λόγος
that changed Jacob's name,
Gen. 32. (s)

s) *De nomin. mut. p. 1088.*

He saith, that the *Manna*
typified the λόγος, or Word
of God. (t)

t) *Alleg. Leg. L. II p. 93.*
B. Quod det. pot. insid. p. 176.
E. De profug. p. 470. A. B.
L. III. Leg. Alleg. 1103. B.

He giveth an Idea of the
Eternal Generation, when he
affirms, that of that which
is Divine there is nothing
cut off, but only it is ex-
tended. (u) And when he
speaks of the Communica-
tion of the Spirit without its
being divided. (w)

u) *L. Quod det. pot. inf.*
p. 172. A

w) *De Gigant. p. 287. C.*

He affirms, that it is the
λόγος, or Word, that is the
Son of God; whom the
Prophet *Zechary* calls *Ori-*
ens. (x)

x) *Deconf. Ling. p. 329.*

He saith, that the λόγος,
or Word, is the true High
Priest, of whom the anti-
ent High-Priests were but
Emblems. (y) He

y) *De prof. p. 666. B, C, D.*
de Summ. p. 597. C.
De vit. Mos. L. III. p. 673. C.

He sets forth the Divine *Word*, as the Mediator between God and Man at the time of the Deluge. (2)

(2) *L. quis rerum div. h.*
p. 509. B. C.
De vit. M. L. III. p. 673. C.

I believe after this, *N. M.* is not very well satisfied in the care that hath been taken in preserving the Works of *Philo*. But though they had been all lost, the Truth, which *M. N.* opposes with such bold and yet vain conjectures, would not have suffered much by it. For *Philo* was but one Jewish Doctor, though he flourished in the time of our Saviour Jesus Christ. But I should be glad to know *M. N.*'s thoughts of an Author of a quite different character from *Philo*.

Doth he believe that the Gospel according to *S. John* was written by *S. John*, or by *Cerinthus*? He that believeth the *Cerinthians* to have been Apostolical Men, must believe *S. John*'s Gospel and the *Revelations* to have been the Work of *Cerinthus*,

and not of *S. John*. No, saith *M. N.* the present *Unitarians* acknowledge the Gospel and the Revelations to have been written by the beloved Disciple of Jesus Christ, that hath given them those lights, which the *Cerinthians* and the *Alogians* had not.

I am very glad it hath: but how can *M. N.* after this maintain that the notion of the λόγος is a *Platonick* Idea? Is it likely that *S. John*, who, setting aside the advantages he had by being the Disciple of Christ, was but an honest Fisherman, had read the Works of *Plato*? Was *Plato* known to the Fishermen upon the Lake of *Tiberias*? or were his Works translated into *Syriac*, which was the only Language they knew? If not, then it is a strange extravagance in *M. N.* to suppose that the notion of the λόγος is a *Platonick* Idea. *S. John* was no doubt well acquainted with the Writings of the Old Testament, and what he said of the λόγος or Word, with plain reference to the
first

first Chapter of *Genesis*, and other places of the Old Testament; he learnt it not in the School of *Plato*, but in that of the Holy Ghost, who inspired him, and who was the same that dictated the Books of the Old Testament.

But after all, is this stile only proper to *S. John*, who was the last Evangelist that writ? The Evangelist *S. Luke* is quoted by *Justin Martyr*, as well as the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, both as Canonical Books; and we know that they speak of the *λογος* or *Word*. *Justin* also quotes the Writings of *S. John*, both Gospel and Revelations. And in all these, there is mention of the *Word* in this notion; the Pre-existence and Godhead of the *Word* is plainly set forth in them. *Socinus* endeavours to elude the proof of it in *S. John's* Gospel, by explaining the word *beginning* by the beginning of the Gospel. *M. N.* corrects *Socinus* for that, and agrees with us that the *λογος* signifies the Virtue by which God created the World, and only differs from us in the question,

Luc. I.
Heb. X.
Joh. I.
Rev. XVI.

whether that all-creating λόγος or *Word* was a Person.

After this, it is easie to judge with what reason or sense *M. N.* rejects the Authorities that *Dr. Bull* brings to shew that the notion of the Pre-existence of the λόγος, was not unknown to the Jews at the time when *S. John* writ. For my part I can't but wonder, setting raillery aside, how he could satisfie himself with what he brings to evade the force of *Dr. Bull's* Arguments.

The Jews, saith he, believed the *Messias* was to be a meer Man, as it appears by the Books of the New Testament, and by those of *Justin Martyr*. From thence he would infer, that the Jews before Christ's time believed nothing of the Pre-existence of the *Messias*; and therefore that the passages drawn from the Books that were written before Christ's time, particularly from the Wisdom of *Solomon*, are of no authority against the Jews to prove that


that they have varied from their Fore-fathers in their notions of the *Messias*. If this reasoning is good, then Christ and his Apostles did them wrong in charging the Jews with so many Errors, on this account, of their corrupting of the Ideas of their Fore-fathers.

Dr. Bull sheweth that in the Book of Wisdom, there are notions of the *Λόγος* that brought up *Israel* out of *Egypt*, and that he was a Divine Person in the judgement of the Writer of that Book. *M. N.* can't deny this, but he hath two ways to make it signifie nothing. The first is, by speaking of that Divine Person with a scurrilous Wit. The other is, by bearing us down with a conjecture of *Grotius*, that though this Book was written by a Jew, yet some Christian or other, who was a Greek, happening on it, hath given it us in the Greek Tongue, but with divers additions to it taken from the Christian Religion. For the first of these, it proves nothing but

* *Apud Eu-*
seb. de
Prep. Ev. p.
 323.
Clem. ad
Cor. 5. 3,
et 27.

but what we know already, that *M. N.* presumes there are Readers that will be scoft out of their Religion. For the second, it is certain that this Book in Greek as we have it, was quoted by *Philo the Jew* *, and *Clemens Romanus*, and afterwards at least forty times by the Fathers of the second Century, who look'd upon it as a Book of undoubted Antiquity. And it seems very probable, that *St. Paul* did reflect on a passage in this Book, (*Wisd. VII. 26.*) when he was writing his Epistle to the *Colossians*, *Col. II. 15.* and again in the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, *Heb. I. 3,* which places *M. N.* may consider at leisure. The Jews therefore that were converted to Christianity must have known this Book; and look'd upon it as a Book that contained the ancient Sentiments of their *Synagogue*.

For the Jewish *Cabala*, or Tradition, which the Learned *Dr. Bull* recommends to his Reader, it is only their traditional Sense of Texts
 of



of their Scriptures, which they antiently understood of the *Messias*. Now for this sort of Jewish Tradition, it is certainly of great use to them that are to dispute against the Jews. But if *M. N.* will not be so just to allow this Tradition, all the World is not so obstinate as he. We find in the antient Writings of the Jews such expresse notions of the Doctrines which the *Socinians* dispute against, that they either must have been forged by Christians, or the Jews before Christ's time must have had quite other notions of these matters than those which the modern Jews have. We agree that these notions were not those of the common People; and it appears plain enough from hence, that when Jesus Christ spoke of himself in such terms, the Jews could not but see that he attributed *Divinity* to himself; the multitude who expected a mighty Conqueror for their *Messias*, seemed surprized at it, and were ready to stone him. These Traditions that we speak of, were the Ideas of such

as

as had taken more pains in studying the Sacred Writings, and had collected the sense of them by attentive Meditation. That this was so, we learn from *Philo* the Jew, who makes a great difference between the Explanations of the Law that they gave to the People whom he calls *novitius*, and those which they reserved for such as had attained to a greater degree of knowledge in the Mysteries of their Religion. This may be seen in his Treatise *de Sacrif. Abel. & Cain*, where he is shewing the Providence of God in events, which the Pagans look'd upon as meerly accidental.

*De Sacr.
Ab. & C.
p. 153. B.
Ed. Paris.
A.D. 1640.*

M. N. doth like himself in abusing *Dr. Bull*, and putting tricks upon his Reader, when he bears him in hand that these traditional Expositions of the Scripture were the very same that were rejected by our Saviour, and exclaims against the Doctor for using Arguments against the *Socinians* that are drawn from a Law, which was set up by the *Pharisees*, and condemn'd by Jesus Christ.

Indeed

Indeed if we admitted of the Authorities of the Jews before Christ's time, as a part of Divine Revelation that is not contained in the Books of *Moses*, *M. N.* would have reason to bring the authority of Christ against such Jewish Traditions. But here is a quite different case now. The Jews having stifled those antient notions of a *Messias*, that according to their Prophecies was to be God as well as Man, we make it appear from the Books of their Ancestors, which were left, and which contain the Old Explications of their Synagogue before Christ's time, that they had such Explications, as they are now forced to reject, or else they must yield up the cause to the Christians.

Now what hath *M. N.* to say against our use of such traditional Explications? He either must deny that we have a right understanding of the old Jewish Paraphrases, or that they are not so antient as they are reputed, or else he must acknowledge that

that the Jews, who are now of the same opinion as himself concerning the nature of the *Messias*, have altered their belief concerning it since our Saviour's time.

I shall not endeavour to refute what *M. N.* saith to take away the authority of two Hebrew Books that *Dr. Bull* quotes for the confirming of those Expositions. *M. N.* according to his great stock of Learning, calls one of them an *obscure Rabbi*, and the other the *unknown Book Tanchuman*. The *obscure Rabbi* that he speaks of is *Moses Bar Nachman*, commonly called *Ramban* or *Moses Girundenfis*, one of the highest note among the Jewish Commentators. The *unknown Book* called not *Tanchuman*, but *Tanchuma*, is as well known among the Learned Jews, as any of their antient Books that are now extant. *M. N.*'s ignorance of these things might well be excused; for he was not bound to understand Hebrew: yet we must needs tell him, that it is not very modestly done of him

him to pass a Judgement upon Authors that he neither knoweth, nor is able to understand.

I will not spend time in answering what he saith of the Works of *Philo* the Jew, that they were written by one *Philo* a Christian, who lived in the second Century after Christ. This is truly an unknown *Rabbi* to all Mankind but *M. N.* for he is the first that ever mentioned him. But he shews by his Critical Remarks on this occasion, that he hath as little skill in Christian Antiquity, as he hath shewn in Hebrew Writers.

Philo speaks frequently of the λόγος that was employed by God in the Creation of the World, and in the Production of his other Works. Now the question is, whether he borrowed this notion from the *Synagogue*, or from the *Platonicks*? That is easie enough to be decided, because whatsoever he says of this matter, he always grounds it on the Books of *Moses* and the Prophets, without once mentioning *Plato* upon the Idea of the λόγος. I

I ought also to observe that *Clement Alexandrinus*, who hath many quotations out of *Philo's* Works, of which some are lost, reckons him not a *Platonick* but a *Pythagorean*. But certainly *M. N.* must have lost his reason, if he maintains that the Works which bear the name of *Philo* were written by a more modern Author than him that writ the *Apology* for the Jews to *Caligula*, whom *M. N.* can't deny to have been *Philo of Alexandria*, that went to *Rome* as their Agent within seven years after Christ's Death. The Style, the Notions, the quotations from his other Writings, and what other Authors who lived after him have quoted from him, are to a Reader of any ordinary judgement such convincing Arguments, that they were written by the same Author, that one that will go about to prove the contrary loses his time and his labour, and so will he that giveth him an answer.

I am not ignorant that some of
the

the Antients after *Eusebius* have imagined, that *Philo* did in his Treatise of the *Therapeutæ* describe the first Christians of *Egypt*; and some of them have gone so far as to say, *Philo* might have seen *S. Peter* at *Rome*, and turn Christian. But all this is nothing else but meer groundless imagination; they are such vain conjectures that those that attentively read *Philo's* Works, and particularly what he saith of the *Therapeutæ*, and that have any knowledge of Church-History, can't but pity those that let such Fathers opinions be imposed upon them by the name of *Eusebius* and his Followers.

I believe I have by this time sufficiently answered all that is worth considering in *M. N's* *Judgement of the Fathers*. According to the Scheme that I proposed. I did not think it worth my while to take notice of several faults that are here and there in his Work, but fall immediately upon the principal ones; my chief design being to shew the False-

K
ness

The Fathers vindicated

ness and Absurdity of his System, which I presume to say I have done.

I have not taken notice of an accusation which he comes up with very often, *viz.* that those of the Orthodox Party were always Persecutors; because it is so notoriously false, that there was no need of refuting it. *M. N.* confesseth that the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, and of the Divinity of our Saviour, was publickly and generally received after *Justin Martyr's* time; and that the Primitive Christians still lived under Persecutions from the Pagan Emperors till *Constantine's* time. What therefore can he mean by this accusation against the Defenders of the *Trinity*? The first Persecutions unto blood that can be found any where among Christians, were by the *Arians*; and those *M. N.* himself is pleased to reckon among his *Unitarians*. With what confidence therefore can he affirm so false a thing, as that is that the Doctrine of the *Trinity* hath been kept up only by Violence and Persecution? But

But there is a blacker Calumny behind, which he throws upon the whole body of Christians; as if they had corrupted the holy Scriptures to make them speak in favour of their Doctrines of the *Trinity*, and of the *Godhead of our Saviour*. He says, in pursuance of this design, they added and left out as themselves pleased; and if their Divisions among themselves had not hindered, they would not have left us any remain of genuine Christianity. This is indeed *calumniating stoutly*; but *the dirt will not easily stick* with sober and learned Men. For of what Scripture doth he say this? The Writings of the Old Testament, those were always in the hands of the Jews, and are so still; so that they can't be corrupted by Christians. For the Scriptures of the New Testament, it is no less ridiculous to accuse the Christians of corrupting them in favour of these Doctrines. For if their Divisions, as he saith, have hindered them from doing this since the times of

the Christian Emperors, then the same have hindred them always; for there have been always divisions among Christians, enough to make them watch one another, and to hinder them from joyning together in the corrupting of the Scriptures.

M. N. may truly say, that the Orthodox Party did in the second and third Centuries complain of the Impudence of the Hereticks in falsifying the sacred Books: and it is to the party of those, whom we call Orthodox Christians, that we owe the preservation of these Books, and the restitution of their Authority, which was so vigorously attack'd by most of the Hereticks. If *M. N.* will take advantage of some various readings that are in the several old Manuscripts, or antient Versions, let him fall on as soon as he pleases; let him exercise his Criticks upon these Texts, and he shall soon have an answer.

4 OC 58

I cannot say that *M. N.* had a design to gratifie the Deist in this; though

touching the Trinity.

though in many things he writes as if they had imployed him. But in this accusation which he repeats so often, and in such virulent Language, he sheweth plainly a design to make the Clergy odious, and bring them under suspicion of having intended to destroy the holy Scriptures, and to change the Christian Religion. For this we must leave him to the Justice of God, who seeth the Hearts, and will render to every Man according to his Works.

Or I might easily have justified the authorities which Dr. Bull hath quoted to prove that the Doctrine of the Divinity of Christ was brought down by Succession from the Apostles till *Justin Martyr's* time; and it would have been easie enough, after the light that I have given into *M. A's* System, to have shewed the vanity of his Objections against them. But I thought that would have engaged me into too great a length. And since Dr. Bull is still alive, and possibly may not think fit to let him escape without

The Fathers vindicated

out some Animadversion, I thought it not so proper to take the business out of his hands; especially since the Doctor hath laid in matter enough for it in those very Books that are written against by this Author.

To conclude; As it was wholly in obedience to your Commands that I composed this small Treatise, so I leave it entirely at your disposal, to do with it accordingly as your great Wisdom shall think fit, to which I shall ever pay an absolute Submission. I am with the most profound respect,

4 OCT 28

Tours, &c.

FINIS.

III. O. I. L. 3.